This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at http://books.google.com/

32101 063611501

Digitized by Google

Library of

Dei Sub Numine Viget

Princeton University.

Presented by

ARTHUR WELLMAN BUTLER
CLASS OF 1892

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

A

COMMENTARY

ON THE

HOLY SCRIPTURES:

CRITICAL, DOCTRINAL, AND HOMILETICAL,

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO MINISTERS AND STUDENTS.

BY

JOHN PETER LANGE, D.D.,

IN CONNECTION WITH A NUMBER OF EMINENT EUROPEAN DIVINES.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN, AND EDITED, WITH ADDITIONS,

BY

PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D.,

ASSISTED BY AMERICAN SCHOLARS OF VARIOUS EVANGELICAL DENOMINATIONS.

VOL. X. OF THE OLD TESTAMENT: CONTAINING PROVERBS, ECCLESIASTES, AND THE SONG OF SOLOMON.

NEW YORK:
CHARLES SCRIBNER & CO., 654 BROADWAY.
1870.

Digitized by Google

THE PROVERBS OF SOLOMON.

THEOLOGICALLY AND HOMILETICALLY EXPOUNDED

BY

DR. OTTO ZÖCKLER,

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY AT GREIFSWALD.

TRANSLATED AND EDITED BY

REV. CHARLES A. AIKEN, D.D.,

PRESIDENT OF UNION COLLEGE, SCHENECTADY, N. Y.

NEW YORK:
CHARLES SCRIBNER & CO., 654 BROADWAY.
1870.

Digitized by Google

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1870, by
CHARLES SCRIBNER, & CO.,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

JAS. B. RODGERS CO.,
ELECTROTYPERS,
52 & 54 N. Sixth St., Philadelphia.

Digitized by Google

PREFACE BY THE GENERAL EDITOR.

The present volume corresponds to Parts XII. and XIII. of the Old Testament Division of Dr. LANGE's *Biblework*, and contains the Solomonic writings, PROVERBS, ECCLESIASTES, and the SONG OF SOLOMON. They form an important part of the Old Testament, and give us the poetry and practical philosophy of the wisest of men, with none of his follies and sins, which were overruled in his writings for the advancement of wisdom and virtue.

The English translation, with additions and improvements, was intrusted to three eminent Oriental and Biblical Scholars, too well known in America to need an introduction. They have done their work well, and have added very materially to the value as well as the size of the original.

In this volume the text of the Authorized Version is superseded by a new metrical version in accordance with the laws of Hebrew poetry. The same will be the case in the other poetical books of the O. T. To retain the prose version of King James' revisers, and to insert the corrections in brackets, would conceal to the reader the beauties of the original as a work of art. In Ecclesiastes, Prof. TAYLER LEWIS has thought best to retain the common version for the Commentary, and to give his metrical version as a separate appendix.

Some remarks will introduce the author of this part of the *Biblework*, and explain the relation which the several parts of the American edition sustain to the German.

DR. ZÖCKLER.

The author of this Commentary on the Solomonic writings belongs to the younger generation of German divines, and appears now for the first time in an English dress; none of his previous writings having been translated.

Dr. OTTO ZÖCKLER was born at Grünberg, in the Grand Duchy of Hesse, May 27, 1833. After a thorough training in classical and oriental philology, philosophy and theology, he entered the career of an academic teacher of theology, A. D., 1856, as *privatim docens*, in the University of Giessen; he advanced to the position of professor *extraordinarius* in 1863, and in the autumn of 1866 he was called by the Prussian Government as professor *ordinarius* to the University of Greifswald, in Pomerania, where he still labors with fidelity and success. He is a very able and learned divine, a fertile author, a modest, retiring and amiable gentleman, of unblemished character, a little hard of hearing, and hence the more devoted to the cultivation of the inner life by study and contemplation, yet wide awake to all the living questions of the age. His learning covers a large ground, especially Exegesis of the O. and N. Testaments, Church History, Apologetics, Natural Sciences. His biography of St. Jerome, with which I am quite familiar, is one of the best historical monographs. He is now engaged on Daniel for LANGE's *Biblework*.

The following is a chronological list of Dr. ZÖCKLER's writings to the present date:

De vi ac notione vocabuli ἐλπίς in N. Tb. diss. inauguralis. Giss., 1857.

THEOLOGIA NATURALIS. *Entwurf einer systematischen Naturtheologie vom offenbarungsgläubigen Standpuncte aus.* Bd. I. Frankft. a M., 1860.

KRITISCHE GESCHICHTE DER ASKESE (*Critical History of Asceticism*); *ein Beitrag zur Geschichte christlicher Sitte und Cultur.* Frankft. 1862.

HIERONYMUS; *sein Leben u. Wirken aus seinen Schriften dargestellt.* Gotha, 1864.

(RECAP) 5201 .561 97.V.10
Digitized by Google

Die Evangelienkritik und das Lebensbild Christi nach der Schrift. 2 *Vorträge.* Darmstadt, 1864.

Commentar zu den SPRUECHEN SALOMONIS. 1866. } in LANGE's *Biblework.*
Commentar zum HOHENLIED U. PREDIGER. 1868. } in LANGE's *Biblework.*
Commentar zum Propheten Daniel (in course of preparation). } in LANGE's *Biblework.*

Die Urgeschichte der Erde u. des Menschen (*The Primitive History of Earth and Man*). 6 *Vorträge gehalten in Hamburg.* Gütersloh, 1868.

Prof. ZÖCKLER is also the principal editor of a valuable apologetic monthly entitled: *Der Beweis des Glaubens* (*The Evidence of Faith*), Gütersloh (Westphalia), since 1865, and of the *Allgemeine Literarische Anzeiger für das evang. Deutschland* (*General Literary Intelligencer for Evangelical Germany*), published at Gütersloh, since 1869.

PROVERBS.

Prof. ZÖCKLER introduces his commentary on this storehouse of practical philosophy and heavenly wisdom with the following preface:

"A theological and homiletic exposition of the Book of Proverbs has difficulties to contend with which exist in an equal degree in but few books of the Old Testament, and in none in quite the same form. Even the most searching investigation is able to gain only partially and approximately fixed points for the determination of the time when the book originated, and of the editorship of its several main divisions as it is now constructed. In almost every new group of Proverbs the linguistic and theological exposition of the individual Proverbs encounters new difficulties—and these difficulties are, in many cases, of such a sort that we must utterly despair of fully assured exegetical results. And finally, to treat the book homiletically and practically, in so far as it regards only brief passages, is rendered more difficult by the obscurity of many single sentences; and in so far as it attempts to embrace large sections, by the unquestionable lack of fixed order and methodical structure, which appears at least in the central main division of the collection (chap. x. 1—xxii. 16), as well as in the supplement added by Hezekiah's men (chaps. xxv.—xxix.)."

"To this is to be added the imperfection of previous expository works, both the scientific and the practical." [The author then reviews the recent commentaries of HITZIG, UMBREIT, EWALD, BERTHEAU, VAIHINGER, and ELSTER, as well as the older works of MICHAELIS, GEIER, STARKE, STÖCKER, MELANCHTHON, and concludes:]

"In view of this condition of exegetical literature, heretofore so unsatisfactory in many ways, the author has at least attempted, with the most conscientious application of his powers, and with the use of the most important works that have hitherto appeared, to effect what might be done to relieve these difficulties, which exist in all directions in considerable numbers. . . . Over many of the obscurities that exist, he hopes that he has thrown substantially the right light; with regard to others, that he has turned attention to the most promising avenues to an appropriate exposition and a useful application; and that for the whole he has proposed a meaning essentially sound, scientifically defensible, and, for that very reason, edifying."

The work on Proverbs was first committed to the hands of the late ROBINSON P. DUNN, D. D., Professor of Rhetoric and English Literature in Brown University. He was one of the most accomplished scholars of New England, and "one of those rare men who, by a happy combination of the gifts of nature and of grace, seemed adapted to usefulness in every department of life." But he had scarcely collected a complete apparatus and finished the rough draft of his translation as far as the opening sentences of § 9 of the Introduction, when he was suddenly called to his rest, Aug. 28, 1867, in Newport, R. I., the place of his birth, at the age of forty-three. His last words were similar to those of Dr. NEANDER: "Good-by, I am going home." His pen was found in the Commentary on the Proverbs, at the page he had reached, as a sign of his last study on earth. His initials are attached to the notes he added.*

* An elegant memorial volume, published by his widow, pp. 237, contains a biographical sketch by Dr. SAMUEL L. CALDWELL, the Commemorative Discourse delivered, at the request of the Faculty of Brown University, by the Rev. J. L. DIMAN, Professor of History in the University, and selections from the writings of Dr. DUNN, which give evidence of his accurate scholarship, elegant taste, lovely character and elevated piety.

Digitized by Google

After the lamented death of Professor DUNN, I secured the valuable services of Dr. AIKEN, then Professor of Latin Literature in Princeton College, and since called to the Presidency of Union College, in the State of New York. A hasty glance at the translation and the grammatical and critical notes is sufficient to convince the reader how much of original research and learning, in addition to the labor of a faithful translation, has been bestowed upon this part of the American edition of LANGE. In compliance with my suggestion, the purely grammatical parts of the Commentary have been transferred as far as practicable to the textual department, in small type, which the lay reader may pass by. The same rule has been followed in Ecclesiastes, and the Song, as it had already been done in Genesis. An unusual number of grammatical references has been made to BÖTTCHER's encyclopædic *Grammar*, which, in the exhaustive fullness of its citations, amounts almost to a commentary on the Hebrew Scriptures. The same scholarly hand is seen in the large number of supplementary and illustrative notes which are scattered through the exegetical parts. The elder English commentators, like TRAPP, MUFFET, are cited not for their scientific, but for their sterling practical value. Of recent commentators, STUART and MUENSCHER, of our own country, both unknown to Dr. ZÖCKLER, have justly been laid under contribution. Considerable additions have also been made to the homiletical department from our rich and varied literature.

ECCLESIASTES.

After the translating and editing of ZÖCKLER's Koheleth had been undertaken by Prof. TAYLER LEWIS, who had so admirably edited the greater part of Genesis, it was found that the state of his health, and the heavy additions which he felt it necessary to make, rendered assistance indispensable. By my advice, therefore, there was procured the valuable aid of his colleague, Prof. WELLS, of Union College. To him that important part, the translation, is due. For the added introductions, dissertations, annotations, the Metrical Version, and the editing generally, Prof. LEWIS is responsible. It is trusted that these will afford no little aid to a better comprehension of this strange and wonderfully impressive portion of Holy Scripture. We have here the ripe fruits of long continued biblical studies from one of our most venerable scholars, who is a man of genius as well as learning. The Metrical Version in Iambic measure, with an introduction thereto, is a new feature, to which we direct the special attention of the lovers of Hebrew poetry.

As a help to the reader, it is thought best to give, as was done in the volume containing Genesis, an index to the principal additions of Prof. LEWIS. Some of these are of considerable extent and unusual interest, and they may all be divided into two classes, according as they are contained in the body of the pages, or in marginal notes.

I. EXTENDED DISSERTATIONS ON LEADING IDEAS.

II. THE PRINCIPAL MARGINAL NOTES.

Digitized by Google

To these may be added many minor marginal notes, together with the notes on particular words, the ancient versions, and various readings, as they are attached to each division of the text. Special attention is here paid to words alleged to belong to the later Hebrew.

THE SONG OF SOLOMON.

The Commentary on the Song of songs [שִׁיר הַשִּׁירִים, Sept.: Ἆσμα ᾀσμάτων, Vulg.: *Canticum canticorum*], as this most beautiful of poems of pure and holy love is called, was prepared by the Rev. Dr. Green, Professor in the Theological Seminary at Princeton.

The difficulty of the book is such as to allow considerable latitude of individual opinion, but it is all important to have a proper view of its spirit and aim. The German author justly rejects both the profane *rationalistic* exposition which can see no more in the Song than a sensual erotic poem, and the opposite *allegorical* interpretation which regards the persons and objects described as mere figures or names for spiritual persons and objects, leaving a large margin for random guess-work and unbridled extravagance.* Most nearly agreeing with his friend, Prof. Delitzsch,

* The allegorical interpretation, it must be admitted, has the authority of many of the greatest divines, both Jewish and Christian, Catholic and Evangelical, and is also sanctioned by the headings of our English Bible. It will probably always retain the ascendancy in the pulpit, and in books for popular devotion. Many of the most eloquent sermons (as St. Bernard's *Sermones in cant. cant.*, and Krummacher's *Salomo und Sulamith*), and of the sweetest hymns (by Gerhardt, Dessler, Dresse, Zinzendorf, Wesley, and Gustav Hahn's, *Das Hohe Lied in Liedern*, Halle, 1853) are based upon this view. If we distinguish carefully between *exposition* and *application*, we may allow a considerable latitude for homiletic and ascetic purposes. One of the very best legitimate practical applications of the passage ii. 15, I have seen, is in a little book of Mrs. H. Beecher Stowe, where the "little foxes that spoil the vines" (ii. 15), are applied, in a series of entertaining homilies, to little faults that disturb domestic happiness. But in an exegetical point of view most of the allegorical interpretations turn out to be arbitrary *impositions* rather than *expositions*. Just as I write, a new attempt in this line comes to my eyes in the *British and Foreign Evangelical Quarterly Review* for Oct. 1869, pp. 773–796. The writer of this article discovers in the Song

Digitized by Google

he adopts the *typical* or *typico-Messianic* view, which is not so old and generally received among orthodox divines as the allegorical, but which has the sanction of such eminent names as LIGHTFOOT, BOSSUET, LOWTH, and is more natural and in harmony with the typical and prophetical character of the whole ancient theocracy, as foreshadowing the substance of Christianity, and preparing the way for its introduction.

The Canticles are probably a nuptial song or lyric drama (melo-drama) from Solomon's best period, and present the ideal Hebrew view of marriage as established by God Himself in Paradise on the basis of the strongest and tenderest passion He has implanted in man; and this ideal is realized in the highest and holiest sense in the relation of Christ to His Church (Comp. Eph. v. 32).

The American editor, while recording his approval of ZÖCKLER's method and standpoint in general, especially his typical view (see pp. 19–25), has expressed his dissent from certain parts of his scheme. He inclines to regard the Canticles as a series of unconnected scenes rather than a well-arranged, continuous drama, with a regularly unfolded plot, as is done by ZÖCKLER and DELITZSCH, also, with various modifications, by LOWTH, EWALD, UMBREIT, BÖTTCHER, HITZIG, RENAN. He is moreover of the opinion that the Song should be more favorably interpreted by itself than from the history and later character of Solomon as given in the first book of Kings. In this last point I entirely agree. Any reference to Solomon's polygamy, unless it be in the way of rebuke, would mar the beauty and purity of the poem, and make it unworthy of its place in the canon.

The next most considerable addition is to the bibliography at the close of the Introduction (pp. 43–47), where a pretty full account is given of English and American Commentators on the Song. The critical and grammatical notes have been very materially enriched both from the editor's own researches and from the early English translations, and from English commentators.

I must add that Dr. GREEN had inserted a considerable number of Arabic and Persian words, but erased nearly all of them in the proof sheets, because, after the type had been procured at considerable trouble, it was found almost impossible to obtain accuracy in characters unknown to the compositors, and because they rather disfigured the pages.

I now commit this new volume to the churches of the English tongue, with the wish that it may be as cordially welcomed, and prove as useful, as the other parts of this Commentary.

PHILIP SCHAFF.

5, *Bible House*, NEW YORK, Nov. 19, 1869.

---

a progressive drama beginning at the gates of Eden and running through the light and shade of the history of Judaism and Christianity till the glory of the millennium. He distinguishes in it the following parts:

1. The Church before the advent, waiting and longing for the coming of Christ. 2d. The theocracy under Solomon, which, in the temple and its worship, afford the fullest and clearest typical revelation of Christ which that dispensation admitted of. 3d. The gradual decadence that followed, in both type and prophecy, which went on till at last it deepened into the darkness of the captivity. 4th. The sudden opening of the gospel day in the advent of the Saviour, and the preaching of the apostles—the voice of the turtle, and the flowers that now begin to cover the earth. 5th. A second night, during which Christ is again absent; this lasts longer than the first, and during it a deeper sleep oppresses the church. On awakening, she is seen seeking her beloved, wounded and bleeding, from the sword of persecution. 6th. The bursting out of the day of the Reformation—the morning of the millennium—and then the church is beheld "terrible as an army with banners," clothed with truth, and shining with a light which makes her the admiration of the nations,—"fair as the moon, clear as the sun."

A few specimens of interpretation on this scheme, will suffice. The kisses of the Bridegroom are the promises of Christ's coming; the "Virgins" who love the spouse (ch. i. 3), like the Virgins in the Apocalypse, represent those who had not defiled themselves with the idolatrous rites of pagan or papal worship; the "wilderness" from which the bridegroom comes on the day of his espousals (iii. 6), is Jewish formalism, Gentile scepticism, and pagan idolatry; and the clouds of smoke, which attended the royal progress, are the symbols of mysterious providences.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

THE

PROVERBS OF SOLOMON.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. THE ETHICAL AND RELIGIOUS RANK AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROVERBS OF SOLOMON.

The collection of Proverbs which bears the name of Solomon is the chief storehouse of moral instruction and of practical wisdom for the chosen people of God under the old dispensation. It forms, therefore, the principal documentary source of the Ethics of the Old Testament, just as in the successive steps of a gradual revelation, it is the peculiar office of the Pentateuch to exhibit the fundamental truths of its Theology, the Psalter those of its Anthropology, and the Prophetical Books those of its Christology and Soteriology. Some of the more general principles and postulates of Ethics, especially much of what belongs to the province of the so-called doctrine of the Highest Good, and, as might be expected, the whole doctrine of the Moral Law, are indeed found in the Books of Moses. Single topics connected with the doctrine of virtue and obligation are occasionally more fully discussed in the Psalms and the Prophets. But the special doctrine of virtue and duty, which must ever hold the chief place in the system of Ethics, finds nowhere else in the Old Testament so thorough, so individualizing, and so lively a presentation as in the Proverbs; and even the more general principles of Ethics, as well as the fundamental maxims of rectitude and law are, if not directly referred to in them, at least incidentally assumed.*

Resting on the basis of the widest and most diverse experience, and adopting the form of the most thoughtful, pithy and suggestive apothegms, they apply to the life of man in all positions, relations and conditions, the moral precepts contained in the law. In other words, what the law reveals as a universal rule for the national life of the covenant people in a religious and a political aspect, the Proverbs apply to the relations and obligations of the private life of each individual of that people. The principle of consecration through fellowship with Jehovah, the God of the Covenant, which was revealed through Moses, and established in general in his legislation, is individualized and developed in detail by Solomon with reference to the special domestic and social relations of his countrymen.

NOTE.—It has been often observed that the Proverbs of Solomon are the chief source of the Old Testament Ethics. ORIGEN, in the Preface to his exposition of the Song of Solomon, expressed the opinion that in the Proverbs Solomon had aimed to discuss the ἠθική, in Ecclesiastes the φυσική, and in the Canticles the λογική or θεωρική (the science of the contemplation of Divine things), and JEROME adopted from him this view (Preface to the Comm. on Eccles., Ep. 30 to Paula).†

* [This threefold division of Ethics, originating with SCHLEIERMACHER, and closely adhered to by ROTHE, is generally adopted in Germany. "*Güterlehre*" is the doctrine of the Good as an object of desire or a thing to be attained. "*Tugendlehre*" is the doctrine of the sentiments and inclination towards virtue. "*Pflichtenlehre*" is the doctrine of the right as the foundation of law. The first and the last are objective; the second is subjective.—R. P. D.]

† In his 107 Ep. to Læta in reference to the education of her daughter Paula, JEROME says; "*Discat primo Psalterium, his se canticis sanctam vocet, et in Proverbiis Salomonis erudiatur ad vitam.*" Compare the title παιδαγωγικὴ σοφία which GREGORY of Nazianzus was wont to give to the Book of Proverbs.

Digitized by Google

LUTHER, in his Preface to the Books of Solomon, written in 1524 (Erlangen ed., Vol. LXIII., p 35), says of the Proverbs: "It may be rightly called a book of good works; for he (Solomon) there teaches the nature of a godly and useful life,—so that every man aiming at godliness should make it his daily Handbook or Book of Devotion, and often read in it and compare with it his life." STARKE (Introd. to the Proverbs, Synops., Pt. IV., p. 1591) thus describes its contents: "It is for the most part a school of Christian Morals; upon the basis of faith it founds the wisest counsels in reference to the believer's duties towards God, towards his neighbor, and towards himself. . . . By means of a great variety of sententious maxims this book teaches man how to escape from sin, to please God, and to secure true blessedness." The elder MICHAELIS (CHRISTIAN BENEDICT) gives a like estimate of the ethical value of the Proverbs. He passes from an exposition of the Psalms to one of the Proverbs with these words: "From the oratory of David we now proceed to the school of Solomon, to find in the son of the greatest of theologians the first of philosophers." On account of the ethical wisdom of the Proverbs of Solomon, the Würtemberg Theosophists, BENGEL and OETINGER, preferred them to most of the other books of the Old Testament. They made them the theme of their devout meditations, and earnestly sought to penetrate their deeper meaning. (See for BENGEL: OSK. WAECHTER's "*Joh. Alb. Bengel: Life, Character*, &c., p. 166). OETINGER, when, as a youthful master of arts, he resided at Halle, thought of lecturing on "*Philosophiam sacram et applicatam*, drawn from the Scriptures, especially the Proverbs of Solomon." This plan he did not, however, carry out. At a later period, when he was a pastor first at Hirsau and then at Walddorf, he diligently studied the Proverbs as the chief repository and source of what he called "*Sensus communis*." He used them for purposes of religious instruction; he wrote them on separate slips of paper, put them in a box, and made his scholars draw them out as lots. He also published a little book of a catechetical nature, with the title "How shall the head of a family exemplify at home the Proverbs of Solomon?" and a larger work called "Common Sense in the Proverbs and Ecclesiastes," Stuttgard, 1753. "The Proverbs," he once observed, "exhibit Jesus with unusual clearness, and he who cannot perceive this knows not Paul's meaning when he says, 1 Cor. xiv. 20, 'In understanding be men'" (see EHMANN's "*Life and Letters of Oetinger;*" also the essay in VILMAR's *Past.-theol. Bll.*, 1865, I., pp. 265 sq., on "Theosophy: Oetinger and the Lutheran Church."—Still earlier the Rostock theologian, SAMUEL BOHL, had attempted in his *Ethica Sacra* (1640) a systematic exhibition of the ethics of Solomon, in the form of a continuous commentary on the first nine and the last two chapters of Proverbs. Most of the modern interpreters have in like manner justly appreciated the superior ethical value of this book. According to KAHNIS (*Luth. Dogmatik*, I., 282) its peculiar excellence lies in the skill with which its author "has presented the maxims of a practical wisdom which aims in all the human relations of the Kingdom of God to govern the lives of men in harmony with the intentions of its founder." ELSTER (*Deutsche Zeitschr. für Christl. Wissenschaft*, 1859, and in his Commentary on the Proverbs) ascribes the importance of this book of Solomon to the fact that "it consists of a didactic religious discussion of practical experience," in the form of proverbial wisdom, which is not mere human prudence, but "a new emanation from the Divine essence itself, a new communication of eternal wisdom, which alone is true wisdom." It is a proverbial wisdom which, "like the Law and the Prophets, has its own peculiar and most important province," and has upon the varied and symmetrical development of the individual man an influence which should be deeply felt and fully recognized. BRUCH (*Weisheitslehre der Hebräer*, pp. 102 sq.), OEHLER (*Die Grundzüge der alttestamentl. Weisheit*, pp. 5 sq.), DELITZSCH (Article *Sprüche Salomo's* in HERZOG's *Real-Encyclopädie*), express themselves in similar terms with reference to the high ethical and religious rank of this book. Even HITZIG, while denying its inspiration, and perceiving in it nothing but human wisdom, recognizes in it "a religious consecration and an irresistible attraction of the heart towards morality," which distinguish this monument of Hebrew proverbial wisdom above all similar productions, whether of Arabian literature or of the Semitic mind in general ("*Die Sprüche Salomo's übersetzt und ausgelegt*," p. xii.).

[COLERIDGE says: "The Book of Proverbs is the best statesman's manual which was ever written. An adherent to the political economy and spirit of that collection of apothegms and essays would do more to eradicate from a people the causes of extravagance, debasement and

Digitized by Google

ruin, than all the contributions to political economy of SAY, SMITH, MALTHUS and CHALMERS together."—Prof. M. STUART says (Preface to his Comm. on Proverbs, p. 9): "All the heathen moralists and proverbialists joined together cannot furnish us with one such book as that of the Proverbs." In his Introd., p. 64, he says: "After all the light which Christianity has shed upon us, we could not part with this book without a severe loss." "The book contains a striking exhibition of practical wisdom, so striking that it can never be antiquated."—J. MUENSCHER, in his Introd. to his Comm. on Proverbs, says, p. xliv.: "The moral precepts of Solomon rest on the foundation of religion and true piety, and in this respect differ heaven-wide from the systems of the ancient heathen moralists."—R. P. D.]

[Dr. GRAY observes, The Proverbs of the inspired son of David "are so justly founded on principles of human nature, and so adapted to the permanent interests of man, that they agree with the manners of every age, and may be assumed as rules for the direction of our conduct in every condition and rank of life, however varied in its complexion or diversified by circumstances; they embrace not only the concerns of private morality, but the great objects of political importance." —Dr. JORTIN says: "They have not that air of smartness and vivacity and wit which modern writers have usually affected in their maxims and sentences; but they have what is better, truth and solid good sense." "Though the composition be of the disjointed kind, yet there is a general design running through the whole, which the author keeps always in view; that is, to instruct the people, and particularly young people, at their entrance into public and active life,—to give them an early love and an earnest desire of real wisdom, and to lay down such clear rules for their behaviour as shall carry them through the world with peace and credit." (See D'OYLY and MANT, Introd. to Proverbs).

BRIDGES (Exposition of the Proverbs, Am. Ed., Pref., pp. iii., vii., ix., *etc.*) says: "This wonderful book is indeed a mine of Divine wisdom. The views of God are holy and reverential. The observation of human nature is minute and accurate." "Doubtless its pervading character is not either *explicit* statement of doctrinal truth or lively exercises of Christian experience. Hence the superficial reader passes over to some (in his view) richer portion of the Scriptural field." "While other parts of Scripture show us the glory of our high calling, this may instruct in all minuteness of detail how to 'walk worthy of it.' Elsewhere we learn our completeness in Christ (Col. ii. 10); and most justly we glory in our high exaltation as "joint heirs with Christ," *etc.* (Rom. viii. 17; Eph. ii. 6). We look into this book, and, as by the aid of the microscope, we see the minuteness of our Christian obligations; that there is not a temper, a look, a word, a movement, the most important action of the day, the smallest relative duty, in which we do not either deface or adorn the image of our Lord, and the profession of His name."

WORDSWORTH (Introd. to Proverbs, pp. ix., x.) says: "The Book of Proverbs is an inspired book adapted to the circumstances of the times of Solomon." "The Holy Spirit, in inspiring Solomon to write the Book of Proverbs, supplied an antidote to the poison of those influences (temptations attending the splendor and prosperity of the times), and has given to the world a moral and spiritual manual, which has its special uses for those who dwell in populous towns and cities, and who are busily engaged in worldly traffic, and are exposed to such temptations as are rife in an age and country like our own, distinguished by commercial enterprise and mechanical skill, and by the production of great works of human industry, in Art, Literature and Science, and also by religious activity, especially of that kind which aims to give to Religion external dignity and beauty, such as reached its highest pitch in the Temple of Solomon." Again, "The Proverbs of Solomon come from above, and they also look upward. They teach that all True Wisdom is the gift of God, and is grounded on the fear of the Lord. They dwell with the strongest emphasis on the necessity of careful vigilance over the heart which is manifest only to God; and on the right government of the tongue, whose sins are rarely punished by human laws; and on the duty of acting, in all the daily business and social intercourse of life, with an eye steadily fixed on the throne of God, and with habitual reference to the only unerring standard of human practice, His Will and Word. In this respect the Book of Proverbs prepared the way for the preaching of the Gospel; and we recognize in it an anticipation of the Apostolic precept concerning all domestic and social relations, 'Whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as unto the Lord.'"

Dean STANLEY (*History of the Jewish Church*, II., 269, Am. Ed.), looking at the other side of

Digitized by Google

the shield, says, This book "has even something of a worldly, prudential look, unlike the rest of the Bible. But this is the very reason why its recognition as a Sacred Book is so useful. It is the philosophy of practical life. It is the sign to us that the Bible does not despise common sense and discretion. It impresses upon us in the most forcible manner the value of intelligence and prudence, and of a good education. The whole strength of the Hebrew language, and of the sacred authority of the book, is thrown upon these homely truths. It deals too in that refined, discriminating. careful view of the finer shades of human character, so often overlooked by theologians, but so necessary to any true estimate of human life."

Dr. GUTHRIE (*Sunday Magazine*, Oct., 1868, p. 15) calls attention in his forcible way to other qualities of the book, and bears a valuable testimony to its experimental worth in a wide sphere. "It fulfils in a unique and pre-eminent degree the requirements of effective oratory, not only every chapter, but every verse, and almost every clause of every verse expressing something which both 'strikes and sticks.'" "The day was in Scotland when all her children were initiated into the art of reading through the Book of Proverbs. . . . I have no doubt whatever—neither had the late Principal LEE, as appears by the evidence he gave before a committee of parliament—that the high character which Scotsmen earned in bygone years was mainly due to their early acquaintance with the Proverbs, the practical sagacity and wisdom of Solomon. . . . . The book has unfortunately disappeared from our schools; and with its disappearance my countrymen are more and more losing their national virtues—in self-denial and self-reliance, in foresight and economy, in reverence of parents and abhorrence of public charity, some of the best characteristics of old manners and old times."—A.]

A.—GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO THE PHILOSOPHICAL LITERATURE ASCRIBED TO SOLOMON.

§ 2. THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN GENERAL, IN ITS RELATION TO THE PHILOSOPHY OF OTHER NATIONS.

The peculiar form in which the ethical doctrines and precepts of the Proverbs are presented is that of the Hhokmah, or Proverbial Philosophy of the Hebrews. It is a species of moral and philosophical instruction in practical wisdom, which though distinguished by its thoroughly religious character from the secular philosophy of all other races, stands in the same relation to the spiritual development of the covenant people as that occupied by this philosophy in reference to the general culture of men who are without the Scriptures. For, whatever answer be given to the somewhat perplexing question, whether the Hebrews can be properly said to have had a philosophy, it is certainly true, that the essential feature of philosophy, the striving after objective wisdom, or after a true conception of the absolute fitness of the world to accomplish its ends, in both a theoretical and a practical aspect, is most completely presented in the Hhokmah of the old dispensation; and that in fact it is only the peculiar form in which this striving develops itself in the Old Testament literature, which distinguishes this Hhokmah from the philosophy of Greek and Roman antiquity. The wisdom of the people of God under the Old Testament is the art of so shaping life in harmony with the divine will, and in obedience to its peculiar laws learned by experience and reflection, as to make one an upright subject of the kingdom of God, in other words, so as to secure at once the divine favor and earthly blessedness. [When NOYES (*A new Translation of the Proverbs, etc.*, Introd. to Proverbs, p. xiv.) says: "It is true that the religion and morality of the Book of Proverbs will not bear a favorable comparison with those of Jesus Christ. Its morality is much less disinterested, being for the most part founded in prudence rather than in love. Its motives generally are of a much less elevated kind than those which Christianity presents . . . . Prudential motives, founded on a strict earthly retribution, are the principal encouragements to a life of virtue which he presents," *etc.*, we recognize the truth which he exhibits, but notwithstanding his supplementary and balancing statements prefer ISAAC TAYLOR's mode of exhibiting the truth. Speaking immediately of the 23d Psalm he says (*Spirit of Hebrew Poetry*, Am. 12mo. ed., p. 38): "The bright

Digitized by Google

idea of *earthly well-being* pervades the Old Testament Scriptures; and this worldly sunshine is their distinction as compared with the New Testament; but then there are many cognate ideas which properly come into their places around the terrestrial idea . . . . A feeling is here indicated which was of that age, and which was approvable then, although it has been superseded since by sentiments of a higher order, and which draw their reason from the substitution of future for present good."—A.] In so far as God is alike the beginning and the end of this pursuit of wisdom, or in so far as it both necessarily springs from the fear of God,—Prov. i. 7; ix. 10; comp. Job xxviii. 28; Ps. cxi. 10; Ecclesiast. i. 16,—and leads to a purifying fellowship with Him, Prov. viii. 35; iii. 16, *etc.*, it has an essentially religious and practical character. Its sphere of reflection and of action must therefore be also more limited than that of the old classical or of the modern philosophy, both of which delight in profound theoretical inquiries in reference to created existence, and investigations of not only the end but also the origin of both nature and man. Those questions concerning the origin of the world and the origin of evil which play so conspicuous a part in the philosophy of ancient and of modern times, are only incidentally discussed in the Hebrew literature of wisdom, whether in the works ascribed to Solomon, the book of Job, or the kindred Psalms; and then only in their relation to the motives and tendencies to practical morality. The divine wisdom which establishes the relation of God to the world, and is at once the chief source and fundamental law of both the subjective and the objective wisdom of men, (Prov. viii. 21; ix. 12; Job xxviii. 24 sq.; Ecclesiast. xxiv.) is always represented rather as the medium of the foreknowledge and the providence of God, than as a creative power, or even as the ideal pattern of the world (the *κόσμος νοητός* of PLATO). In fine, the essential character of the Hebrew philosophy is far more practical than speculative; it is as little inclined to pursue or to prompt genuine speculation as it is to identify itself with secular philosophy in general, and with unaided human reason to investigate the final causes of things. It is essentially a divine philosophy planting its feet upon the basis of the divine revelation, and staying itself upon the eternal principles of the divine law; and it is this determinate and positive character of its method of conceiving and teaching, that chiefly distinguishes it from the philosophy of other nations and of other times. Moreover, the habitual, and not as was the case with many ancient philosophers, the occasional, adoption of the poetical form of the Gnome or didactic apothegm for conveying its instructions, must be regarded as a marked and important feature of this whole body of Old Testament literature, and as a decided indication of its method and of its tendencies.

NOTE 1.—The Strasburg theologian, J. F. BRUCH, in his "*Weisheitslehre der Hebräer; ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Philosophie,*" Strasburg. 1851, thoroughly discusses the question whether or not the doctrine of the Hhokmah in the Old Testament is to be considered philosophy in the strict sense, and decides it in the affirmative. This was the prevailing opinion in former times among the theologians of all the churches. Jesuits, *e. g.* MENOCHIUS in his learned work, "*De Republica Hebræorum,*" Book VII., Chap. 1; many of the Reformers of the 17th and 18th centuries, especially the followers of DESCARTES and COCCEIUS; and Lutherans like the aforementioned BOHLIUS in his "*Ethica Sacra,*" or the eminent BUDDÆUS in his "*Introductio ad Historiam philosophiæ Hebræorum,*" 2d ed., Leipsic, 1720, all spoke without hesitation of the Hebrew philosophy, of the philosophy of Solomon, David, Moses, Joseph, and Abraham. Indeed they often ventured to trace the philosophy of the patriarchs as far back as to Adam. Even at the beginning of the present century BLESSIG, in his Introduction to J. G. DAHLER's "*Denk- und Sittensprüchen Salomo's*" (Strasburg, 1810), unqualifiedly characterized the proverbial poetry of the Hebrews as philosophical; DE WETTE, in his Hebrew Archæology, spoke of "the speculative and practical philosophy of the Hebrews;" and STAEUDLIN wrote a dissertation on "The Philosophy, the Origin and Design of the Book of Job." (See his "*Beiträge zur Philosophie und Geschichte der Religion und Sittenlehre,*" II., 133 sq.; compare the same author's "*Geist der Sittenlehre Jesu,*" I., 74 sq.). Theologians of the most diverse schools agreed in assuming in general the existence among the early Hebrews of a style of wisdom which might claim the undisputed title of a philosophy.

The opposite view is represented not only by many later philosophers, especially those of the critical school of KANT, but also by such theologians as limit the notion "philosophy" to the

Digitized by Google

scholarly scientific speculative inquiries peculiar to modern times, and must therefore consider not only the Hebrews, but all the Semitic races, and indeed the Orientals in general, as totally destitute of a philosophical habit of mind. Such was the opinion of BRUCKER before the time of KANT, when he asserted in his Critical History of Philosophy (Leipsic, 1767, I., 64), "*non confundendam esse Hebræorum sapientiam cum philosophia proprii nominis atque significationis.*" KRUG (*Philosophisch-Encyclopädisches Lexicon*, II., 328) thinks that anything like philosophy or philosophical wisdom is not to be looked for among the ancient Hebrews." REINHOLD (*Lehrbuch der Geschichte der Philosophie*, p. 15) denies in general the existence of any proper old Oriental philosophy side by side with the Greek. RITTER (*Geschichte der Philosophie*, I., 48) bluntly says, "Of the only Asiatic nations whose literature is known to us, we may venture to assert, without fear of much contradiction, that in the early times they had no philosophy. Among these are the Hebrews," *etc.*

Of the more recent theologians R. F. GRAU ("*Semiten und Indogermanen in ihrer Beziehung zu Religion und Wissenschaft*," p. 28 sq.) has warmly and zealously supported the proposition that "the Semitic mind in general has no capacity for either philosophy or science," and LUTHARDT (in the "*Leipziger Vorträge über die Kirche, nach Ursprung, Geschichte und Gegenwart*, pp. 18 sq. [pp. 19 sq. of the translation published by Messrs. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1867]) adopts his opinion at least in reference to the Hebrews.

All these scholars manifestly have too limited and partial a conception of philosophy. They with one consent understand by it an exercise of the human intellect controlled by the rigid laws of logic and carried on in a scientific method such as was never seen among the early Hebrews, or indeed among any of the older Eastern nations. But philosophy means far more than this. It is in itself, as its etymology, *φιλοσοφία, i. e. studium sapientiæ* [love of wisdom], indicates, and as the whole practice and method of the oldest Greek philosophers down to the time of ARISTOTLE demonstrates, nothing but a love for wisdom; an earnest endeavor to find a theoretical and a practical solution of the problems of our earthly life; that intellectual effort which strives to re-establish the proper relation between the absolute omniscience of God, and the relative knowledge possessed by the reason of man. A philosophy and philosophical science in this wider sense must be claimed for the people of God under the Old Testament. We cannot, however, quite agree with BRUCH (*ut supra*, p. 20 sq.) when, having defined philosophy in its *objective* aspect as "the science of the Absolute, or the science of the supreme necessary causes of all that is or that must be," and in its subjective aspect, "as the unaided inquiry after the absolute, or rational thinking in so far as renouncing all external authority it investigates the supreme necessary causes of all that is or that must be," he ascribes both to the Hebrews. For, in the first place, that which among them corresponds to the philosophy of other nations is not properly science, but rather a knowledge and comprehension, an intellectual effort and reflective process in general; and in the next place, it is not so much the "supreme necessary causes" as the chief practical ends of our earthly life and being which occupied the mind of the Hebrew thinker. It is then only philosophy in its subjective character, as above defined, which can in the main be ascribed to the Hebrews, and even this in a form quite unlike that in which it presents itself to BRUCH, one which secures the full recognition of its predominant practical and theological character. A philosophy consisting in such an essentially practical or ethical tendency of the mind, which by an examination of the highest moral and religious ends of all human and superhuman existence, seeks to determine the normal relation between God and the world, and thus to point out the way to truth and blessedness, may without hesitation be ascribed to the people of the Old Covenant. It is indeed a philosophy, which though its shape and dress are religious and poetical rather than didactic and scientific, contains within itself all the elements which are essential to strictly scientific development, or to an entrance into the sphere of dogmatic and moral and theological speculation.

In this properly limited sense has EWALD, among others, (*Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, III., 82) recognized the existence of an old Hebrew Philosophy. "Philosophy," says he, "may exist even where the rigid laws of thought (logic) are not observed, or where no attempt is made to reduce all truths and conceptions to a symmetrical whole (a system). This, it may be admitted, is its final aim,—though this aim like every other human aspiration is so often tho-

Digitized by Google

roughly erroneous and misleading;—it is not, however, its beginning nor its constant living impulse. Its beginning and very life is rather the intense and unquenchable desire for investigation, and for the investigation of all objects, both higher and lower, remote and near, human and divine. Where the problems of existence allow thoughtful men no rest, where they provoke among the mightiest intellects of any people, or of several nations at once, an unwearied rivalry in the attempt to solve them, Philosophy is in the bloom and vigor of youth. In that earlier time the noblest of the Semitic races had plainly reached that stage when the Greeks were far from having approached it; and Israel, whose higher religion furnished besides a special impulse to reflection on the relations of things, now entered with them upon this nobler field of honor in the most generous rivalry."

Similar views are expressed by UMBREIT in his ingenious and instructive, though somewhat prolix observations "on the wisdom of the East" (*Commentar über die Sprüche Salomo's, Einleitung*, pp. iii. sq.); by DELITZSCH (Article "*Sprüche Salomo's*," in HERZOG's *Real-Encycl.*, XIV., pp. 712 sq.), as well as by the editor of this Biblework in his General Introduction to the Old Testament (Genesis p. 19, [Am. Ed.]). OEHLER in his work "*Die Grundzüge der alttestam. Weisheit*, pp. 5 sq., as well as his follower KAHNIS (*Lutherische Dogmatik*, I., 304), essentially agrees with the above statements. The latter says excellently, among other things, "To find in the life of nature and of man, in the revelations of the kingdom of God, in the whole world, the divine 'wherefore,' the divine fitness to accomplish the proposed end, was the great aim of the wisdom of Solomon. Here unquestionably existed a tendency to science, to philosophy. But the national life of Israel rested on too divine a foundation to permit great freedom of inquiry, and the kingdom of God had too many practical aims to favor a purely theoretical exploration of the objects of existence. Springing from the practical this wisdom sought to further the practical," *etc.*

NOTE 2.—In harmony with his above-quoted definition of the philosophy of the Hebrews, as an inquiry into the highest necessary causes of all that is or that shall be, BRUCH (pp. 69 sq.) introduces the cosmogony of the first two chapters of Genesis into his representation of the philosophy of the Old Testament. He thus regards the substance of these chapters as a portion of a philosophical system, and indeed in its essential features as the earliest instance of philosophical reflection among the Hebrew race. (HERDER, as is well known, held similar views. In his "*Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit*" he termed the Mosaic cosmogony "an ancient philosophy of the history of man"). This view of BRUCH's is connected with his assumption of the purely human and moreover half-mythical character of the Mosaic narrative. It is therefore to be decidedly rejected, together with his opinion that the Old Testament "wisdom" is the product of unaided human speculation, and that no divine or specifically supernatural factor is to be recognized in the Old Testament revelation in general.

NOTE 3.—The word חָכְמָה primarily denotes (in accordance with the fundamental meaning of the root חכם, حَكَمَ in Arabic, where it means to fasten, to hold fast, and then to separate, to decide) the fixing of an object for cognition, and secondarily, simply knowledge, insight. It is therefore in Prov. i. 2 used as precisely synonymous with דַּעַת, and elsewhere, as in Isa. xi. 2 sq., as at least parallel with בִּינָה. The חָכָם is then in the first instance the wise, the learned man in general (comp. Jer. viii. 9), whether he be a judge (1 Kings iii. 28: comp. the corresponding Arabic word which always signifies a judge), or an artificer (Ex. xxviii. 3; xxxi. 6; Jer. x. 9), or finally a cunning, subtle man who can use his craft for his own or for others' advantage (Job v. 13, comp. 2 Sam. xiii. 3; xx. 16). In the religious realm חָכְמָה naturally denotes insight into that upright dealing which pleases God and conforms to the divine law, a knowledge of the right way which is to be followed before God, and of the wrong one which is to be shunned. In short it is that practical uprightness, founded on religious enlightenment, in which the true happiness of man consists, and which is therefore frequently represented by תּוּשִׁיָּה (*i. e.* well being and wisdom in one), *e. g.* Prov. ii. 7; iii. 21; viii. 14; xviii. 1; Job xi. 6; xii. 16; xxvi. 3. Compare in general HITZIG, *Die Sprüche Salomo's, Einleitung*, p. lii.

Digitized by Google

sq. The latter, however, gives a somewhat different and less correct etymology of the word. He defines חָכָם as one who possesses the spiritual power of control and determination, and חָכְמָה as the power of moral self-subjugation. He thus gives to the notion of government a prominence which is by no means justified by the Arabic حكم.

Note 4.—The מָשָׁל or Hebrew gnome, as the distinctive artistic form adopted by the Old Testament philosophy and proverbial poetry, will be particularly discussed in a later section. We may, however, here observe that of all the titles borrowed from kindred secular literature, and applied to the Proverbs of Solomon on account of their peculiar form, none appears more just and appropriate than that adopted by Bruch, who terms them (p. 104) an Anthology of Hebrew Gnomes. In the explanation and justification of this title he, however, as he does elsewhere, disparages the theopneustic character of this Book of Scripture.

§ 3. THE AGE OF SOLOMON, OR THE GOLDEN AGE OF THE HEBREW LITERATURE OF WISDOM.

As among other nations philosophy is not wont to assume its proper form till a long time after the religious and civil foundations of national culture are securely laid, so in Israel no season of undisturbed reflection and of philosophical inquiry and instruction could be enjoyed, before the protracted storms and conflicts of the period of the Judges had fixed the religion of the law in the depths of the popular consciousness, or before the reigns of Saul and David, the earliest kings, had firmly established the theocratic national life. The power of external enemies must first in some way be broken and overthrown, and the prosperity of the citizen and the political and social influence of the nation upon the life of the surrounding nations must be to a certain degree secured; but this could not be effected before the brilliant and glorious though warlike reign of David. Furthermore, as an element of the internal culture of the nation, the spirit of the law must have begun to receive a new invigoration and a fresh inculcation, which it derived from the schools of the prophets which sprung up after the time of Samuel. Hand in hand with the directly religious activity of this prophetic company the national poetry must make its earliest start, and create for that philosophy a proper literary and æsthetic form.

These conditions were not all of them fully realized until the time of Solomon, when the people were blessed with a long period of peace, rich in earthly possessions and enjoyments of all sorts; they then began a lively and widely extended intercourse with foreign nations, and with an extending view reaching even to Tarshish and Ophir, their thought and their activity received the most various impulses in a direction which was no longer narrow and strictly national, but more or less universal and as broad as humanity itself.* There was therefore associated with the priests, the prophets, the warriors, the judges, a new class of notables, that of the Hhakamim (חֲכָמִים, 1 Kings iv. 30, 31; Jer. xviii. 18; Prov. i. 6; xiii. 20; xxii. 17), the wise, or the teachers of wisdom, who began to bear their part in the whole work of training the nation. A pretty large number of such wise men, of considerable importance, must have appeared under Solomon, and have been associated with him as the most famous of all. For the books of the Kings mention besides him some of his contemporaries, *viz.*: "Ethan, the Ezrahite, and Heman, Chalcol and Darda, the sons of Mahol," as representatives of the wisdom of that time (1 Kings iv. 31; comp. 1 Chron. ii. 6), and compare the wisdom of these Hebrew Hhakamim with that of all the children of the East country, and all the wisdom of Egypt" (1 Kings iv. 30). Whether they did or did not form a well de-

* ["That stately and melancholy figure (Solomon's)—in some respects the grandest and the saddest in the sacred volume—is, in detail, little more than a mighty shadow. But, on the other hand, of his age, of his court, of his works, we know more than of any other." (Stanley, *Jewish Church*, II., 184). And the accomplished author goes on to indicate the multiplying points of contact with the outer and the later world, and with secular history; and adds (p. 186): "To have had many such characters in the Biblical History would have brought it down too nearly to the ordinary level. But to have one such is necessary, to show that the interest which we inevitably feel in such events and such men has a place in the designs of Providence, and in the lessons of Revelation." See also pp. 252 sq.—Prof. B. B. Edwards (*Writings, etc.*, II., 402), speaking of the fitness of the age to develop this species of poetry, says: "It was the period of peace, extended commerce, art, reflection, when the poet could gather up the experiences of the past, and embody them in pithy sayings, sharp apothegms, instructive allegories, or spread them out in a kind of philosophical disquisition."—A.]

Digitized by Google

fined, exclusive class of popular teachers gathered about some leader or master, whether there were thus special schools for the wise, or the schools of the prophets were also chief places of culture for the disciples of the Hhokmah, these Hhakamim of the age of Solomon and of subsequent ages must be considered a very important factor in the limited mental development of the people, and as a factor possessing, like the prophetic and the priestly order, an independent importance (comp. Jer. xviii. 18; Ez. vii. 26). They had doubtless offered a vigorous resistance to those frivolous impulses of the לֵצִים, the freethinkers and insolent scoffers, that had manifested themselves since the times of Saul and of David. Their positive agency was exerted in the propagation and dissemination of that deeper religious knowledge and practical wisdom of life, beside which all worldly prudence, fine culture and enlightenment must appear as foolishness (comp. נָבָל, נְבָלָה, נְבָלוֹת, *etc.*; Prov. xiii. 20; xvii. 21; Ps. xiv. 1; Is. xxxii. 6). The first decided manifestation of this new intellectual tendency, together with the literature produced by it under Solomon's peaceful reign, marks this bright summit of the entire theocratic development in the Old Testament as the golden age and the really classic epoch of this especially important branch of the intellectual culture in the life of the covenant people.

NOTE 1.—The independent significance of the חָכְמָה as a special tendency of the mind, exerting with the נְבוּאָה, or the gift of prophecy, an important influence has been recently estimated with special correctness by EWALD. In his dissertation "on the popular and intellectual freedom of Israel in the time of the great prophets down to the destruction of Jerusalem" (*Bibl. Jahrbücher*, I, 96 sq.), he says, among other things, "It is not easy to conceive correctly how high a development was reached in the pursuit of wisdom (Philosophy) in the first centuries after David—and it is not usual to consider how mighty was the influence which it exerted on the entire development of the national life of Israel. The more closely those centuries are reviewed, the greater must be the astonishment at the vast power so early exerted on all sides by wisdom as the peculiar concern of many men among the people. It first openly manifested itself in especial circles of the nation, whilst in the peculiarly propitious age after Solomon eager and inquisitive pupils gathered about individual teachers until ever-improving schools were thus formed. But its influence gradually pervaded all the other pursuits of the people, and acted upon the most diverse branches of authorship." The existence of especial schools of the wise, like those of the Prophets, thus asserted, cannot be satisfactorily proved. DELITZSCH's remark in favor of this assumption (*ut supra*, p. 717), that the usual form of address in the Proverbs, בְּנִי, my son, which is not that of a father to a son, but of a teacher to a scholar, implies that there were then בְּנֵי חָכְמָה, *i. e.*, pupils of the wise, just as there were "sons of the prophets," and that there must also have been "schools of wisdom," is and must remain a mere hypothesis. It is moreover an hypothesis, which from the acknowledged wide application of the conception בֵּן, son, in Hebrew, and its almost absolute lack of all support in the Proverbs as well as in the other books of the Old Testament, must always be regarded as a rather unsafe one. Comp. BRUCH, pp. 57 sq., who is at all events so far correct that he observes: "The Hebrew wise men were not philosophers by profession; they constituted no class distinct from others, but might belong to different classes." For there is the less reason for supposing from the above cited passage (Jer. xviii. 18) that there was a special class of Hhakamim, beside that of the priests and the prophets, from the fact that in the parallel passage, Ez. vii. 26, the notion of "the wise" is represented by that of "the ancient," זְקֵנִים.

NOTE 2.—The antithesis between לֵץ and חָכָם which runs through the entire body of Old Testament literature pertaining to wisdom has been discussed in an eminently instructive manner by DELITZSCH, *ut supra*, pp. 713 sq. He shows very strikingly how "in the age of Solomon, which was peculiarly exposed to the danger of sensuality and worldliness, to religious indifference and freethinking latitudinarianism," the number of לֵצִים necessarily increased, and their skepticism and mockery must have assumed a more decided and aggravated form. "For those men who despised what is holy, and in doing so laid claim to wisdom (Prov. xiv. 6), who, when permitted to speak, indulged in contention and bitterness (xxii. 10), who carefully shunned the company of the Hhakamim, because they fancied themselves superior to their reproofs (xv. 12), the age of Solo-

Digitized by Google

mon," he says, "first invented the title לֵץ [scorner]. For in the Psalms of the time of David their common designation is נָבָל (which occurs in Prov. xvii. 21 only in the general sense of low fellow, Germ. *Bube* [Eng. 'Booby.' It occurs also in Prov. xvii. 7, and xxx. 22, and the corresponding verb in xxx. 32—R. P. D.], while the word לֵץ is found in no other than the 1st Psalm, which has a later origin. One of the proverbs of Solomon (xxi. 24, comp. xxiv. 8) gives a definition of the new term: "Proud and haughty scorner (לֵץ) is his name who dealeth in proud wrath." The conscious self-sufficiency of his ungodly thoughts and deeds distinguishes him from the פֶּתִי, the simple, who has been only misled, and may therefore be reclaimed (Prov. xix. 25; xxi. 11). His disowning the Holy, in opposition to a better knowledge and better opportunities, distinguishes him from the כְּסִיל ["foolish," *i. e.*, gross or stupid], the אֱוִיל ["foolish," *i. e.*, lax or remiss], and the חֲסַר־לֵב [the man "void of understanding," lit., lacking heart, *i. e.*, sense], all of whom despise truth and instruction through want of understanding, narrowness and forgetfulness of God, rather than from essential perverseness."

NOTE 3.—Of the four wise contemporaries of Solomon mentioned in 1 Kings v. 11 (iv. 31 according to the older division of chapters [the one followed in our English Bible]) Heman and Ethan appear in Ps. lxxxviii. 1 and lxxxix. 1 as "Ezrahites," *i. e.*, descendants of Ezrah or Zerah, the son of Judah (Num. xxvi. 13, 20). Chalcol and Darda (in the parallel passage, 1 Chron. ii. 6, Dara) are designated as בְּנֵי מָחוֹל, *i. e.*, either "sons of Machal," a man otherwise unknown, or if מָחוֹל be taken as an appellative, "sons of verse," *i. e.*, singers, leaders of the chorus (comp. Eccl. xii. 4). LUTHER's translation, "poets," and his reference of the title to all the four, are unsupported by the original. Comp. KEIL, *Commentar zu den Büchern der Könige*, pp. 42 sq.

§ 4. SOLOMON AND THE POETRY OF WISDOM WHICH MAY BE CALLED SOLOMON'S IN THE STRICTEST SENSE.

As the chief representative and promoter of the Jewish literature of wisdom, we have Solomon himself ["not only the AUGUSTUS of his age, but its ARISTOTLE" (STANLEY)]. The Old Testament exalts the wisdom of this monarch, as a direct gift of Divine grace * (1 Kings iii. 5-12; iv. 29), high above that of all other wise men, whether of his own or of other nations,—especially above that of the teachers of wisdom already named, Heman, Ethan, Chalcol and Darda (1 Kings iv. 30, 31). This is described as consisting, in the first place, in the highest virtues of the ruler and the judge, or, as it is expressed in 1 Kings iii. 9, in "an understanding heart to judge thy people, that I may discern between good and bad;" and in the second place, in an unusually wide and varied knowledge as the basis of his teaching, which related to all the possible relations of created existence. [Comp. STANLEY's *Jewish Church*, II., pp. 254 sq.]

It is this vast erudition which is referred to in the expression "largeness of heart † (רֹחַב לֵב) even as the sand that is on the sea shore," which, with the words "wisdom and understanding exceeding much," is used in 1 Kings iv. 29 to describe his extraordinary endowments. With the same intent it is said of him, ver. 33, that "he spake of trees, from the cedar tree that is in Lebanon even unto the hyssop that springeth out of the wall; he spake also of beasts, and of fowl and of creeping things and of fishes." Among these discourses of his upon all possible manifestations of life in nature are doubtless meant wise sayings in reference to their deeper sense, and the Divine majesty and wisdom reflected in them, physico-theological observations and descriptions, therefore, such, for example, as still present themselves to us in the concluding chapters of the Book of Job (chaps. xxxviii.—xli.), and in several of the sublimest Psalms (viii.; ix.; civ., *etc.*); or shorter aphorisms, parabolic reflec-

* ["He showed his wisdom by asking for wisdom. He became wise because he had set his heart upon it. This was to him the special aspect through which the Divine Spirit was to be approached, and grasped, and made to bear on the wants of men; not the highest, not the choice of David, not the choice of Isaiah; but still the choice of Solomon. 'He awoke, and behold, it was a dream.' But the fulfilment of it belonged to actual life." DEAN STANLEY, *History of the Jewish Church*, II., 196.—A.]

† LUTHER's translation, "*getrostes Herz*" [a comforted, then a courageous or confident heart], must be rejected as contrary to the sense of the original. Comp. KEIL *in loc.*, who correctly explains "largeness of heart" as "comprehensive understanding," "intellectual capacity to grasp the widest realms of knowledge."

Digitized by Google

tions and pointed sentences, such as are quite numerous in the Proverbs and in Ecclesiastes (*e. g.*, Prov. vi 6–8; xx. 1 sq.; xxvi. 1 sq.; xxvii. 3 sq.; xxx. 15 sq.; comp. Eccles. i. 5 sq.; vii. 1 sq.; x. 1 sq.; xii. 1 sq.). It is the manifold materials and themes of both the lyrical and the didactic poetry of Solomon (or, according to 1 Kings iv. 32, his "Proverbs" and "Songs"), which in that noteworthy passage are mentioned as proofs of the unusual extent of his knowledge, this theoretical foundation of his wisdom, or are pointed out by the prominence given to a few noted examples from the vegetable and the animal world. JOSEPHUS indeed rightly understood the passage as a whole, when he found that it ascribed to Solomon a comprehensive knowledge and a profound philosophical view of natural objects (*Antt.*, VIII., 2, 5: οὐδεμίαν τούτων φύσιν ἠγνόησεν οὐδὲ παρῆλθεν ἀνεξέταστον ἀλλ' ἐν πάσαις ἐφιλοσόφησεν [he was not ignorant of the nature of any of these things, nor did he pass them by unexamined, but he philosophized concerning them all]. A similar correct estimate of the nature and extent of the philosophical knowledge of this great monarch is found in IRENÆUS (*Adv. haer.*, IV., 27, 1), who, on the authority of the same passage says of Solomon, "*eam quæ est in conditione* (*i. e.*, κτίσει) *sapientiam Dei exponebat physiologice.*" He thus in like manner ascribes to him not perhaps a purely descriptive or historical knowledge of natural objects, but a knowledge of nature serving as a basis for fine religious and philosophical observations and ethical instructions in wisdom.

Many of the fruits of this learned pursuit of wisdom must have had a literary character. According to 1 Kings iv. 32 "he spake three thousand proverbs, and his songs were a thousand and five." Not only then had he inherited from his father David, in undiminished fertility, the power of composing songs, the gift of both sacred and secular lyrical verse, but he also originated and established a new species of Hebrew poetic art, that of gnomic didactic poetry, of which before his time there had existed but mere germs, imperfect attempts completely eclipsed by his achievements. Proportionably few specimens of either class of his poetical productions have come down to us. Instead of one thousand and five songs we have in the Canon but two Psalms, which bear his name, the 72d and the 127th. The exclusion of so large a number of his lyrics from the collection of the religious verse of his nation may have been occasioned either by their lack of a directly religious character, or by their too individual bearing. In reference to another monument of the lyrical poetry associated with the name of Solomon, the Canticles, it is still an undecided and controverted question whether Solomon was the proper and immediate author of it, or rather some contemporary poet who chose him as its subject (see § 5).

The remains of his gnomic didactic poetry, as they are presented in the Proverbs, are much more numerous. Even this collection, however, contains not more, perhaps, than one quarter of those 3,000 sayings which Solomon uttered; inasmuch as several parts of the book are by their titles expressly ascribed to other authors, and of the remaining 746 verses hardly the whole can be directly ascribed to him (see § 12). It will always be uncertain whether those 3,000 proverbs of which it is expressly said that he "spake" them, were all actually recorded by him or one of his contemporaries, or whether many of them, as matters of merely oral tradition, were not gradually lost.

That in general he spoke more than he wrote, so that the greater part of the utterances of his wisdom consisted in pithy maxims and acute sayings, like the riddles of the modern Orientals, may be pretty safely inferred from the statement, that "there came of all people to hear the wisdom of Solomon, from all kings of the earth, which had heard of his wisdom" (1 Kings iv. 34). The same inference may be drawn partly from the Scripture narrative, and partly from the old Jewish tradition preserved by JOSEPHUS in reference to the Queen of Sheba's visit to his court (1 Kings x. 1 sq.), as well as from the account of his contest with King Hiram, and with the Tyrian Abdemon, in the proposing of ingenious riddles. (JOSEPHUS, *Antt.* VIII., 5, 3).

NOTE 1.—Besides songs (שִׁירִים), gnomes or maxims (מְשָׁלִים), and riddles (חִידוֹת), HITZIG, *ut supra*, p. xvi., ascribes fables to Solomon. "The discourse concerning beasts, trees, fowl, *etc.*, ascribed to him (in 1 Kings iv. 33)," he thinks, "cannot be properly referred to the substance of his maxims, but is most naturally understood of his invention of fables." This is a rather arbitrary conceit of HITZIG's, which he unsuccessfully tries to sustain by the hypothesis which he

Digitized by Google

throws in, that "perhaps in the אֵזוֹב, 1 Kings iv. 33 (hyssop), the name of Æsop lies concealed" (Αἰσωπος=ὑσσωπος ??). Notwithstanding the contrary assertion of HERDER, in his well-known work, "The Spirit of Hebrew Poetry" (II., p. 13), the Old Testament offers no example of a proper fable. The story of the bramble invited by the trees to be their king (Judg. ix. 8-15) is in its whole plan and tendency much more of a parable than a fable.

NOTE 2.—According to Oriental traditions in reference to Solomon and the Queen of Sheba, her name was Balkis or Belkis; she became Solomon's concubine, or his actual wife (the first is asserted by the Himyaritic Arabs, the latter by the Æthiopians); she bore him a son, Menilehek, with the surname *Ibn-el-hagim*, son of the wise; she first brought to Palestine the root of the genuine balsam, afterwards cultivated at Jericho and near Engedi (comp. 1 Kings x. 10, and in addition JOSEPHUS, Antt. VIII. 6, 6), *etc.* Legends of this sort, invented especially by the Rabbis to heighten the kingly glory and wisdom of Solomon, and found some of them in JOSEPHUS (*ut supra*), others in the Talmud (*e. g. Jalkub Melachim*, p. 195), others in the Koran (Sura 27), others in later Arabic, Æthiopic and Persian documents, abound in the comprehensive Turkish work *Suleiman name, i. e.* the Book of Solomon, which, according to VON HAMMER, consists of 70 folio volumes. Comp. VON HAMMER "*Rosenöl*, or Oriental Legends and Traditions from Arabic, Persian and Turkish sources," Vol. I., pp. 147–257. See also H. LUDOLF, *Hist. Æthiop.*, II., *c.* 3, 4: POCOCKE, *Specimen hist. Arab.*, p. 60; CAUSSIN DE PERCEVAL, *Essai sur l'histoire des Arabes*, I., pp. 76 sq.; and P. CASSEL, *Elagabal*, in the Elberfeld "*Vorträge f. d. gebildete Publikum*," 1864, p. 182.

NOTE 3.—[The question of Solomon's moral qualification to be the author of some of the books contained in the canon of the Scriptures has sometimes perplexed honest disciples, and been made a specious argument in the mouths of cavillers. The point is well put and the answer well given by ARNOT, *Laws from Heaven for Life on Earth*, pp. 11–13. "The choice of Solomon as one of the writers of the Bible at first sight startles, but on deeper study instructs. We would have expected a man of more exemplary life—a man of uniform holiness. It is certain that, in the main, the vessels which the Spirit used were sanctified vessels: 'Holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.' .... But the diversity in all its extent is like all the other ways of God; and He knows how to make either extreme fall into its place in the concert of His praise. He who made Saul an apostle did not disdain to use Solomon as a prophet. .... If all the writers of the Bible had been perfect in holiness,—if no stain of sin could be traced on their character, no error noted in their life, it is certain that the Bible would not have served all the purposes which it now serves among men. It would have been Godlike indeed in matter and mould, but it would not have reached down to the low estate of man—it would not have penetrated to the sores of a human heart. .... Practical lessons on some subjects come better through the heart and lips of the weary, repentant king than through a man who had tasted fewer pleasures, and led a more even life. . . . . Here is a marvel; *not a line of Solomon's writings tends to palliate Solomon's sins*. .... The glaring imperfections of the man's life have been used as a dark ground to set off the lustre of that pure righteousness which the Spirit has spoken by his lips."—A.]

§ 5. THE SONG OF SOLOMON IN ITS RELATION TO THE LITERATURE OF WISDOM ASSOCIATED WITH SOLOMON.*

The opinion that the Song of Solomon is not only a production of the age of Solomon, but most probably the work of Solomon himself, is favored both by its numerous allusions to the personal and historical relations of this king (*e. g.* iii. 2; iv. 4; vi. 8; vii. 5; viii. 11), and by its general æsthetic character, its lively conception of nature. Thus it manifests a decided preference for comparisons with natural objects of all sorts, especially with such as are distinguished

*[While there must be conceded to be weight in the objections urged by ISAAC TAYLOR (chap. iii. of his "*Spirit of Hebrew Poetry*") to the recognition of a proper *drama* in the Scriptures, we cannot agree with him that it is only with "a very forced meaning" that such books as Job and Solomon's Song can be called dramatic. There is, on the other hand, need to guard against the fondness of some for assimilating the Scriptures in their descriptive terms to secular literature; is there not in the other direction such an error as hyper-fastidiousness?—A.]

Digitized by Google

either by their beauty or their variety; it refers not only to numerous important places of both Northern and Southern Palestine, but also to regions, cities and persons beyond the limits of Palestine (*e. g.* Kedar, Damascus, Pharaoh, *etc.*). Had it been composed merely with reference to Solomon, it would not have been ascribed to this monarch either in the title of the Masoretic text, or by the unanimous tradition of Jewish antiquity. It is manifestly a product of that extremely rich and fruitful poetical activity of Solomon, described in 1 Kings iv. 32, 33. In virtue of its erotic contents it belongs essentially to that division of his poetry which is there indicated by the mention of the songs which were a thousand and five, and thus to the lyrical class, whose characteristic features must be recognized in it, though with UMBREIT, EWALD, DELITZSCH and others, we regard it as a dramatic composition. For even though this pre-eminently probable view of its artistic form be adopted,—a view which alone offers a thorough and generally satisfactory refutation of the recently somewhat popular theory, which divides the entire composition into a simple cycle of "love songs,"—the essentially lyrical and erotic character of its separate parts is ever unmistakable; so that the name of a drama in the narrower and stricter sense of the word is not on the whole applicable to it, but rather only that of a "lyrical drama" (BÖTTCHER), a garland of erotic songs joined in dramatic unity (DELITZSCH). But notwithstanding this its lyric and dramatic, or perhaps even melo-dramatic form, and notwithstanding its somewhat wide deviation from the Maschal form of the Proverbs, there exists between its fundamental idea and that of the strictly didactic or aphoristic poetry of Solomon a significant inner connection. The Song of Solomon must undoubtedly be classed with the Hhokmah poetry in its wider sense, because its fundamental idea when rightly viewed, must be admitted to belong to the circle of those ethical ideas which form the chief and the favorite subjects of Solomon's doctrine of wisdom. This fundamental idea consists in the exaltation of conjugal love and faithfulness as the most excellent and sure foundation of earthly prosperity, as a moral force in life triumphing over all the misery and mischief of this earth and even death itself. This fundamental idea is prominent in passages like chap. vii. 7, 8, and viii. 6–8, which are closely related to expressions like those found in Prov. v. 18, 19; xviii. 22; xix. 14; xxxi. 10 sq. This must be admitted to be the chief topic in the poem and the central point in its descriptions, whether we assume, with EWALD and others, that the design is to celebrate the changeless constancy and innocence of the Shulamite, that was proof against all the flatteries and artful temptations of the luxurious Solomon, or with DELITZSCH, that the work belongs to an earlier period in the life of that king, before he had sunk into the foul depths of polygamy and idolatry, and that consequently it refers to his chaste relations to a single wife. It is evident that the latter view is more harmonious with the opinion which, on both internal and external grounds, asserts the authorship of Solomon, than is that of EWALD, or than the interpretation most nearly related to it adopted by HUG, BÖTTCHER and the author of this general commentary; it also favors equally, if not still better, the recognition of a secondary or a mystical reference of the poem to the Messiah. For as a representation of the rapturous joy and bliss arising from the conjugal relation between Solomon, the prince of peace, and his beloved Shulamite, the poem admits of innumerable typical and prophetic applications to Christ and His Church. And these applications render superfluous all other expositions of its Christological contents, such as have resorted to various allegorizing expedients, from the earliest periods of the Church down to the time of H. A. HAHN and HENGSTENBERG [with whom must be reckoned as in general sympathy a considerable number of British and American expositors, among the most conspicuous and emphatic of whom is Bishop WORDSWORTH]. The mystery of the Song of Solomon is that of the marriage relation, and therefore the poem not only admits of that somewhat general Messianic sense which belongs to every poetical celebration of bridal love and conjugal faithfulness within the range of the Scriptures (comp. Eph. v. 32), but also appears as a Messianic prophecy of a specific typical significance, as a prediction in which the marriage of a theocratic king of Israel is described as an especially suggestive analogue and type of the relation of Christ to the Church of the New Testament. In this aspect it closely resembles the 45th Psalm, which likewise celebrates an Old Testament royal marriage as a type of the New Testament covenant relation between Christ and His Church; this Psalm, however, pro-

Digitized by Google

bably refers to a later prince than Solomon, and both by this its origin, in a period after Solomon, and by the unmistakable decrease, in its delineations, of the favorite ideas and characteristic imagery of Solomon's poetry, it shows that it must have sprung from another sphere of spiritual culture and production than that of the classic Hhokmah literature of the earlier age.

[All comment on this view of Solomon's Song, together with all comparative and supplementary presentation of views that have been held in Great Britain and America, is deferred to the Introduction and Exegetical notes connected with our author's companion Commentary on the Book, which is contained in the present series and will be found translated in the present volume].

NOTE.—In these hints with reference to the relation in which the Song of Solomon stands to the literature of wisdom which bears his name, we have mainly followed DELITZSCH. In his "*Untersuchung und Auslegung des Hohenliedes*," 1851, p. 171, he does not hesitate to designate it as "a production of the Hhokmah,"—a species of literature cultivated and employed by Solomon with conspicuous skill. This he does in virtue of the broadly human and ethical character of the idea of conjugal love and union which forms its chief theme. "For," he adds, arguing pertinently in support of his view, "the Hhokmah of the age of Solomon is devoted to the exposition of those creative ordinances of the Cosmos, which have a broader range than the national limits of Israel, and of the universal axioms of religion and morality. The poetry of the Hhokmah is therefore didactic; and both proverbial poetry and drama were developed by it."

DELITZSCH's view of the Song of Solomon and of its ethical and theological value, is in general more interesting and in all respects more satisfactory than any other modern one; it is also preferable to that of the respected founder of this general Commentary, who, on p. 36 [Am. Ed.] of the General Introduction to the Old Testament, expresses the view "that the poem doubtless sprung from the theoretic indignation provoked by the anticipated allowance of religious freedom by Solomon, his polygamy implicating him with heathenism." The fundamental idea is therefore held to be that "the Virgin of Israel, or the theocracy, refuses to be numbered with the heathen wives, or religions, as the favorite of Solomon, but turns to her true betrothed, the still remote Messiah."

We cannot adopt this view, chiefly because the arguments for the genuineness of the poem or the authorship of Solomon, seem to us to outweigh all that lie against it. As little, and indeed still less, can we approve the two conceptions most nearly related to this of LANGE. That of HUG ("*Das Hohelied in einer noch unversuchten Deutung*," 1813) refers the poem to the time of Hezekiah, and considers it as a symbolical expression of the desire of the ten tribes of Israel for reunion with the kingdom of Judah represented by the king of peace, Hezekiah—Solomon. That advocated by BÖTTCHER (*Die ältesten Bühnendichtungen*, 1850) regards it as a lyrical drama, produced and represented in the kingdom of Israel about the year 950 B. C., some time after Solomon's death, and aimed at the royal house and the manners of the harem, so hostile to the life of the family. A more extended critical discussion of these views would here be out of place. An examination of the various modifications of the Messianic allegorical interpretation, as well as of the purely historical or profane erotic view (THEODORE of Mopsuesta, CASTELLIO, J. D. MICHAELIS, HERDER, EICHHORN, HITZIG, *etc.*), must be left for the Introduction to this book of Scripture.

§ 6. THE BOOK OF JOB, CONSIDERED AS A PRODUCT OF THE POETRY OF WISDOM, KNOWN IN THE BROADER SENSE AS SOLOMON'S.

The Book of Job must also be without doubt classed with the productions of the poetical Hhokmah literature, and indeed, as a whole, with even more justice than the Song of Solomon. For although its composition cannot be confidently referred to the time of Solomon, since verbal and other considerations seem to indicate a later period for its origin, its inner relationship to the chief characteristic productions of that literature, to the Proverbs on the one hand and to Ecclesiastes on the other, is so much the less doubtful. Its ethical and religious tendency, developed in the representation of the conflict and the victory of a godly man in sore trial, and in the justification of the divine dealing in the face of the apparent injustice of such sufferings as his,

Digitized by Google

and the peculiar method in which it develops this fundamental thought, by means of conversations and discourses which are made up now of gnomes or moral maxims strung together like pearls, and again of lively and symbolical pictures from nature and from human life,—both alike prove the close connection of this didactic poem with the proverbial poetry of Solomon, as we have above (§§ 3, 4) characterized it. Moreover, the manner in which the poet in chap. xxviii. rises to the idea of the absolute wisdom of God, and represents a participation in it as dependent on a godly and upright course, is very closely related to that which appears in passages like Prov. viii. 22; ix. 12; Eccl. xii. 13; Prov. i. 7; iii. 16, *etc.* The fundamental principle and the didactic tendency of the book seem in all essential features to have sprung from the same style of seeking after wisdom and of religious and philosophical inquiry as the Proverbs and Ecclesiastes; and if, in consequence of a certain tinge of skepticism peculiar to its theological views and reflections, in which the decidedly skeptical attitude of the Preacher to a certain extent betrays itself, it forms a sort of connecting link between these two books, so on the other hand it is by virtue of its poetical form most nearly related to the Song of Solomon. For like this it appears in the poetical garb of a drama, of a drama, however, which, in so far as it bears an impress of an *epico*-dramatic rather than of a *lyrico*-dramatic (melodramatic) kind, deviates from the pure central and typical form of this species of poetry in a different direction from that taken by the Song of Solomon. It is on this account, therefore, to be likened to such intellectual creations as DANTE's *Divine Comedy* (or even as the philosophical dialogues of Plato, so far as these may be considered as artistic poetical productions in the wider sense), rather than to the erotic lyrical dramas or idylls of other nations.*

At all events the interlocutory dramatic style of the poem prompts one to fix the time of its composition as near as possible to that of the Song of Solomon, and to regard it as having originated, if not under Solomon, at least in the age immediately following him. This period is indicated on the one hand by the sublime character of its descriptions of nature, reminding one strongly of the universally extended horizon of the epoch of Solomon (compare especially chaps. xxxviii.-xli. with 1 Kings iv. 33), and on the other by the traces appearing in passages like ix. 24; xii. 17 sq.; xv. 18 sq., of a decline already begun in the glory of the kingdom, and of heavy national calamities. That the whole book must in any case have appeared long before the Babylonish captivity, is evident from such a familiarity with its contents as a whole, and with individual descriptions in it, as is exhibited by the prophets Ezekiel (xx. 14, 20) and Jeremiah (xx. 14 sq., comp. Job iii. 3 sq.). This origin before the exile is to be claimed also for the discourses of Elihu in chaps. xxxii.-xxxvii. the more confidently, in proportion as they unmistakably form an essential and indispensable link of connection between the conversation of Job with his three friends, and the manifestation of Jehovah which brings the final solution of the whole problem.

[Among English authors who agree in this classification of the Book of Job few are more emphatic in their assertions or more felicitous in their illustration than Dean STANLEY (*Jewish Church*, II., 270-1): "Nothing but the wide contact of that age with the Gentile world could, humanly speaking, have admitted either a subject or a scene so remote from Jewish thought and customs, as that of Job." "The allusions to the horse, the peacock, the crocodile and the hippopotamus, are such as in Palestine could hardly have been made till after the formation of Solomon's collections. The knowledge of Egypt and Arabia is what could only have been acquired after the diffusion of Solomon's commerce. The questions discussed are the same as those which agitate the mind of Solomon, but descending deeper and deeper into the difficulties of the world," *etc.*—On the other side, apart from formal commentaries, one will hardly find a clearer and more vigorous presentation of the reasons, both in the style and substance of the Book of Job, for assigning it an earlier date, "an age as early at least as that of the Israelitish settlement in Palestine," than is given in chap. 8 of ISAAC TAYLOR's *Spirit of Hebrew Poetry*.—A.]

NOTE.—If the Book of Job belongs to the epoch of Solomon, there is the more reason for re-

* Compare the excellent essay of G. BAUR, "*Das Buch Hiob und Dante's göttliche Komödie, eine Parallele,*" in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1856, III.

garding this period as one of unequalled richness in the manifold variety of its poetical ideas, its species and forms of poetic art. For besides the religious lyric and the proverbial poetry, both of the chief forms of the Old Testament drama, the religious-erotic and the religious-didactic or philosophical, must have attained their maturity during this period; and there is the more truth in what EWALD—who, moreover, refers the Book of Job to the period just before the exile—remarks in characterizing this epoch: "Thus at this time poetry expands, seeking new paths in every possible direction, though she could only enter them. This is the period of the full formation and broadest development of Hebrew poetry, when it reveals all its latent capacities, and gathers up all its scattered forces; and it is just this that is here new and peculiar" (*Die poetischen Bücher des alten Bundes*, I., p. 19). Compare HAEVERNICK, *Einleit. in das A. T., herausg. von* KEIL, Bd. III., p. 12: "Thus Solomon excels his father in fruitfulness of poetic inspiration, and this fruitfulness testifies to the great wealth of this period in poetical productions. As the splendor and richness of Solomon's peaceful reign is a fruit of David's strifes and victories, so the poetry of his time is but the rich unfolding of the fruit planted and nourished by David. It proves itself to be such by its peculiar character of peaceful objectiveness, while the poetry of David is the thorough expression of deeply stirred subjective emotion. The blessedness of the peace, which, after long and bitter conflicts, the theocracy enjoyed under Solomon, reflects itself as clearly in the 72d and 127th Psalms as in the Song of Solomon, and gives to the latter, notwithstanding its thoroughly emotional contents, a repose and objectiveness of attitude which has long since overcome all struggle and conflict. With this is also connected the broader horizon which poetry gains under Solomon, as well as the complete development and rounding out of its form which likewise marks this period." *etc.* Many of the characteristics here mentioned belong as well to the book of Job; this is not, however, the case with all of them. The passages above quoted [on the preceding page], for example, refer rather to a disturbed and troublous period, than to the peaceful repose and glory of Solomon's reign. On this account we do not venture to adopt without hesitation the view that the book originated in this period, as held by LUTHER, DOEDERLEIN, STAEUDLIN, HAEVERNICK, KEIL, SCHLOTTMANN, HAHN, VAIHINGER, and others. We regard as more probable the assumption of a somewhat later composition (adopted by the general Editor; see *Introd., etc.*, p. 35). We do not, however, for that reason, with EWALD, HIRZEL, HEILIGSTEDT, BLEEK, and others, assign its origin to the seventh century before Christ; or, with CLERICUS, GESENIUS, UMBREIT, VATKE, BUNSEN, and others, refer it to the exile or the period that immediately followed it.

§ 7. THE LITERATURE OF WISDOM AFTER SOLOMON; *a*) ECCLESIASTES.

To the productions of the Hhokmah that undoubtedly belong after Solomon is to be referred Koheleth or the Preacher (קֹהֶלֶת, Ἐκκλησιαστής). This is a didactic poem, which not only by its extended monologue in the Maschal form, but also by its express designation of the speaker as "the son of David," and "King in Jerusalem," seems to betray an origin direct from Solomon. The entire weight of all those considerations, whether of an internal or a verbal character, which claim attention, compel the assumption of an origin not only after Solomon, but even after the exile. For the numerous Chaldaisms in its diction, the references to the oppressive rule of unworthy kings of a non-Israelitish race, *e. g.*, iv. 13-16; v. 8; viii. 1 sq.; x. 4 sq., as well as many allusions to circumstances and events after the exile, such as vi. 2, 3; viii. 10; ix. 13 sq.; xii. 12—all together compel us to recognize the book as a literary monument of the later Persian period. Complaints of the vanity of all earthly things, in the form of disconnected monologues, not, however, exactly separate aphoristic sentences like those of the Proverbs, but rather as somewhat extended reflections, are here put into the mouth of the wise King Solomon. The rhetorical dress by means of which this is accomplished appears the more suitable, since a king who had not only acquired an unusually extended knowledge of earthly things, but also had surrendered himself to the inordinate enjoyment of them, should be regarded as a pre-eminently appropriate preacher concerning their nothingness and transitoriness. The complaints which the book contains on this topic sometimes rise to doubts in reference to the moral government of the world; *e. g.*, iii. 10 sq.; iv. 1 sq.; vi. 8 sq.; vii. 15 sq.; ix. 2 sq., or where this is not the case, at least

Digitized by Google

leave apparently unreconciled the contradiction between the Divine perfection and the vanity of the world. Its philosophy of life has therefore with a certain degree of justice been explained as a sceptical one. It has indeed even received the name of a "Song of Songs of Scepticism."* The entire absence of the Divine covenant name, Jehovah, and the occurrence of frequent exhortations to the cheerful enjoyment of life, instead of possible admonitions to obedient subjection to the law (ii. 24-26; iii. 12 sq; iii. 22; v. 17-19; viii. 15; ix. 7-10; xi. 7 sq.; xii. 7 sq.), might besides seem to justify the suspicion of an attitude religiously indifferent and morally lax, which is not seldom charged upon the author. He was, however, far removed from proper Epicureanism, or indeed from atheistic impulses. He in fact never contents himself with uniting the traditional faith and his sceptical view of the world in a merely external "Concordat between the fear of God and the cheerful enjoyment of the present" (KAHNIS, *ut supra*, p. 309). But in a time inclined to the abandonment of faith in God's holy and just government of the world, he clings to such a faith with a touching constancy, and defends the fact of the wise rule of the Eternal and Omnipotent God against all the frivolous scoffs of fools (ii. 26; iii. 20 sq.; v. 1; v. 17-19; viii. 14; ix. 1-3; compare ii. 13; iv. 5; x. 2 sq.; x. 13, 14). And in an age when his people had little or nothing to hope for in the way of external national prosperity and increase, when moral dullness, apathy and despondency might thus easily master the individual members of this people, he is never weary of pointing out the righteous retributions of the future as a motive to the fear of God, the chief and all-comprehending virtue of the wise (iii. 14-17; v. 6; vi. 6, 10; viii. 12 sq.; xi. 9; xii. 13, 14), and of commending unwavering constancy in individual callings as the best prudence and the surest defense against the sufferings and the temptations of our earthly life (compare ii. 10; iii. 22; v. 17, 18; viii. 15, *etc.*). It is especially the high estimate which he puts upon this faithful endeavor to fulfil one's earthly duty, this "cheerfulness in labor," which reveals the close relationship between his practical view of life and that of the Proverbs of Solomon, and reveals his place within the circle of those Hhakamim whose spiritual thought and action in the earlier age has left its worthiest monument in that collection of Proverbs, and in the Book of Job.

NOTE 1.—The assumption that Solomon was the immediate author of the Book of Ecclesiastes, which once exclusively prevailed, and is still at this time defended by L. VAN ESSEN (*Der Prediger Salomo's*, Schaffh., 1856), H. A. HAHN, *Commentar, etc.*, 1860), and E. BOHL (*Dissertatio de Aramaismis libri Koheleth*, Erlangen, 1860), is refuted not only by the arguments above given, which favor its origin in the period of the Persian sway, but still more especially by many passages in which the use of the name of King Solomon is manifestly but a free and poetical one; *e. g.*, i. 12; i. 16; ii. 6; and particularly xii. 9-14, in which the author speaks of his own person in distinction from the Preacher. Compare BLEEK, *Einleitung*, p. 643; KEIL, *Einleitung*, p. 435.

NOTE 2.—The charges which have of late been often brought against the Book of Ecclesiastes, *viz.*, that it teaches merely a "religion of the present," that its moral and religious tendency is simply negative, that it inclines to fatalistic scepticism and to the lax morality of Epicureanism (LOWTH, DOEDERLEIN, DE WETTE, KNOBEL, in part also HITZIG and BRUCH, according to whom "the scepticism of this book rises even to bitter anguish and utter despair of finding any aim or order in human life" [*ut supra*, pp. 68, 238 sq., 383 sq.]), are met by the passages above cited, in which patient devotion to one's personal earthly calling, together with a cheerful mind and thankful enjoyment of God's temporal gifts, is recommended. These passages are of special importance, since they significantly exhibit the peculiar practical tendency of the book. It is the New Testament virtues, *ὑπομονή, χαίρειν τῇ ἐλπίδι, ἐργάζεσθαι μετὰ ἡσυχίας* (Rom. xii. 12; 2 Thes. iii. 12, *etc.*), in their peculiar Old Testament form, and in accordance with that view of the world inculcated in the more advanced Hhokmah doctrine, which are here substantially exhibited and commended to the tempted saints of the theocracy after the exile.

Compare LUTHER's Preface to the writings of Solomon—"The other book is named Koheleth, which we call the Preacher; and it is a book of consolation. When a man would live obediently

* So HEINRICH HEINE designates it in his "*Vermischte Schriften*," 1854, 1. In like manner DELITZSCH, *Commentar zum Buch Hiob* (in KEIL and DELITZSCH's *Bibl. Comm. zum A. T.*), p. 5.

according to the teaching of the first book (*i. e.*, the Proverbs), and perform the duties of his calling or of his office, the devil, the world, and his own flesh oppose, so that he is wearied of his condition. . . . . Now as Solomon in the first book teaches obedience, as against foolish desire and curiosity, so in this book he teaches patience and constancy in opposition to discontent and temptation, and a peaceful and joyful waiting for the final hour." Comp. the *Preface to the Latin Commentary* (*Opp. exeget. ed. Schmid et Irmischer*, T. XXI., p. 5): *Hunc librum Ecclesiasten rectius nos vocaremus Politica vel Œconomica Salomonis, qui viro in politia versanti consulat in casibus tristibus et animum erudiat ac roboret ad patientiam, etc.* ["This book, Ecclesiastes, we should more correctly call the Politics or Economics of Solomon; for he is giving counsel in adversity to a man engaged in public life, and is training and strengthening his spirit to patience," *etc.*] For similar passages see ELSTER, *Commentar über den Prediger Sal.*, 1855, Introd., pp. 14 sq. Besides this expositor (see especially pp. 27 sq.), EWALD (*Einl. zu Koheleth*, pp. 177 sq.), HAEVERNICK (*Einl.* III., 449 sq.), VAIHINGER (*Ueber den Plan Koheleth's*, *Stud. und Krit.*, 1848, pp. 442 sq.), and HENGSTENBERG (*Der Prediger Salom. ausgelegt*, 1859), have, among recent writers, with cogent arguments, defended the ethical character and contents of the book against such attacks. Compare also the profound essay of VILMAR, "*Ueber Koheleth*," in the *Pastoraltheol. Bll.*, 1863, 1, 241 sq.

§ 8. CONTINUATION. *b*) THE PSALMS OF WISDOM.

Proverbial poetry most clearly combined with lyrical appears not only in the writings of Solomon, but also in those of many poets of the later age. Certain intermediate forms of composition therefore occur which may be classed with one as well as with the other species of poetry. Such are those Psalms, which, though they do not directly teach wisdom, yet sing the praise of the fear of God as the source of all wisdom, and exhibit a didactic tendency, both by the Maschal form which they adopt, and by proclaiming the praise of the law of the Lord and their exhortations to its faithful observance. They may be briefly designated as Hhokmah-Psalms, and may be regarded as gnomes expanded into lyrics, or as the combination of several wise adages into a lyrical didactic whole. The shortest of the two Psalms ascribed to Solomon, the 127th, appears to be in a measure a gnome thus expanded into a lyrical form. Of the later Psalms those belong to the same category, which consist of praises of a life led in the fear of God and the faithful observance of the law,— Ps. i., cxi., cxii., cxxv. and cxxviii. Of these the second is especially worthy of notice, in that it closes with the same commendation of the fear of God as the beginning of wisdom (ver. 10), which is found at the beginning of Solomon's Book of Proverbs (Prov. i. 7, comp. ix. 10, *etc.*), and at the end of Ecclesiastes and of the 28th chapter of the Book of Job. The 119th Psalm is also a Psalm of wisdom on a magnificent scale, an alphabetical arrangement [lost of course in our versions] of inspired praises of the Divine word, and of the blessings which result from obeying it,—which LUTHER has well styled "the Christian A. B. C. of praise, love, power, and use of the word of God." Here belongs also the 49th Psalm, which describes the transitoriness of the happiness of the ungodly, and contrasts with it the hope of the righteous resting on God. For this purpose it adopts a form which is expressly termed "speaking of wisdom" (ver. 3 [E. V.]), a "parable," a "dark saying" (ver. 4 [E. V.]). The 78th Psalm, which belongs to Asaph, asserts its didactic character by the use of similar expressions. Yet its contents, which are descriptive of the history of redemption rather than gnomically instructive or contemplative, show that it ought not to be classed with the proper psalms of wisdom, even though its tendency, like that of several other of the Psalms of Asaph, might in general be called didactic. Those Psalms of David also, which contain didactic matter, differ almost throughout both in their contents and their form from the Hhokmah poetry of the age of Solomon, and of that immediately succeeding, and only incidentally coincide with a few of the above named psalms of wisdom; *e. g.*, Ps. xv. 2 sq., with Pss. i., cxi., cxii.; Ps. xiv. 8 sq., with Ps. cxix.

The title מַשְׂכִּיל borne by some of David's psalms, *e. g.*, Pss. xxxii., lii., as well as by Asaph's, the 78th, affords no ground for regarding these songs as productions of the Hhokmah poetry, or in general as merely didactic poems; for מַשְׂכִּיל is to be rendered neither as "Instruction" nor

Digitized by Google

as "Didactic poem," but most probably with DELITZSCH as "Meditation," or even with HITZIG and others, as "Form, Image, Invention." The Psalter then contains in general no Hhokmah poems of the period before Solomon, since the above named psalms of this class, all belong more probably to a later age, and indeed for the most part to the period after the exile; they are consequently contemporary with Ecclesiastes rather, perhaps, than with the Book of Job, or with the original materials of the Book of Proverbs.

§ 9. CONCLUSION.—c) THE APOCRYPHAL LITERATURE OF WISDOM (SIRACH, BARUCH, THE BOOK OF WISDOM, *etc.*).

In the Apocryphal writings of Jesus, son of Sirach (*Σοφία τοῦ Σειράχ*, Ecclesiasticus), and of the anonymous author of the book of Baruch, and of the "Wisdom of Solomon," the Hebrew literature of wisdom celebrates its second spring-time upon Alexandrian Hellenistic soil. No one of these works can have originated earlier than the second century before the Christian Era, at least in the linguistic form and structure in which they now exist. For the Ptolemy under whom the younger son of Sirach* clothed in its present Greek garb the Hebrew work of his grandfather of the same name (a Jew of Palestine), can be no other than Ptolemy Physcon, or Ptolemy Euergetes II. (B. C. 170–117). The Book of Wisdom, according to internal evidence, belongs rather to the more advanced than to the earlier period of Alexandrianism; it must probably have been produced, therefore, not until near the age of Philo, rather than have been composed by a contemporary of Aristobulus, or, as some claim, by Aristobulus himself. The book Baruch, finally, which has as little to do with the old Baruch of the school of the prophets, as the "Letters of Jeremiah" which it contains have to do with the old prophetic teacher, is very certainly quite a late post-canonical production. No one of these works—and this is quite as true of the book Tobias, and the "Prayer of Manasseh," which exhibit at least some points of contact with the later Jewish literature of wisdom—reaches back even as far as the time of Ecclesiastes, the latest production of the canonical or classical Hhokmah poetry. In their literary artistic character, and their religious didactic substance, the three works named above are distinguished one from another in this, that the collection of gnomes by Jesus, son of Sirach, in regard to contents as well as form, appears to be mainly an imitation of the Proverbs, without, however, attaining the classical excellence of its model; that, furthermore, the "Wisdom of Solomon," less rich in genuine theological and ethical substance, in its didactic form (as a monologue) and its free poetical appropriation of the person of Solomon, approaches Ecclesiastes quite as much as it differs from it in the, not sceptical but, Platonic speculative stamp of its argument; and that finally Baruch, which attempts to array the fundamental ideas of the doctrine of wisdom in the form of the old prophetic admonitions, commands, and letters, reaches nothing better than a dull, spiritless reproduction of these prophetic forms, of as little theological as philosophical value.

NOTE.—The collection of proverbs by the son of Sirach, in spite of the occasional originality and beauty of its contents, still falls far below the poetic perfection and the theological ripeness of the model furnished by Solomon. It therefore cannot be regarded as a composition bearing the stamp of inspiration and worthy of a place in the Canon. These points are conceded even by several of the most recent defenders of the Apocrypha against the criticisms of the English Reformed School; *e. g.*, HENGSTENBERG (*Evang. Kirchen-Zeitung*, 1853, Nos. 54 sq.; 1854, Nos. 29 sq.) and BLEEK (*Studien und Kritiken*, 1853, II.). BRUCH also, in particular, has commented very justly on the literary value of Ecclesiasticus as compared with the Proverbs. He says in his "*Weisheitslehre der Hebräer*," p. 273: "The true Hebrew gnome did indeed stand before this sage as a lofty ideal. This was the goal toward which he pressed, but which he was not able to reach. Only now and then does he attain in his proverbs the condensed brevity, the suggestive fullness of meaning, and the telling rhythm of proposition and antithesis, which

* [A genealogy based on the assumed correctness of the first prologue to the Book of Ecclesiasticus has been constructed as follows: 1. Sirach. 2. Jesus, son (father) of Sirach (*author* of the book). 3. Sirach. 4. Jesus, son of Sirach (*translator* of the book). See B. F. WESTCOTT's articles, "Jesus, the son of Sirach," and "Ecclesiasticus," in SMITH's *Dictionary of the Bible*.—A.]

Digitized by Google

distinguish the Proverbs of Solomon. In many cases it is only with difficulty that he succeeds in comprehending a thought, in its rounded fullness of meaning, within the narrow limits of a single proposition. Still less frequently does he bring corresponding members into a true antithetic relation. He usually carries out his thoughts through a series of complementary proverbs, which not seldom run out at last into dull prose. The true poetic spirit is altogether wanting to the son of Sirach. He frequently expresses himself, it is true, in imagery, but then he heaps figure upon figure improperly, and in his similes falls into the inflated and fantastic. The quiet attitude of reflection would better befit the whole individuality of this Jewish sage," *etc.*

Furthermore, that Sirach, notwithstanding his comparative lack of originality and independent creative power, was still no mere imitator of Solomon's Proverbs, but that besides this he made use of other collections of ancient and esteemed maxims, appears from some hints in his own book (*e. g.*, xxiv. 28; xxxiii. 16). It appears also from the fragments of ancient Hebrew proverbs which still occur here and there in the Talmudic literature of the Jews, which fragments point to the existence of similar collections of gnomes by the side of and before that of the son of Sirach. Comp. BRUCH, p. 274; DELITZSCH, "*Zur Geschichte der Hebräischen Poesie*," pp. 204 sq.; BERTHEAU, "*Exeget. Handbuch zu den Spr. Sal.*," Introd., pp. xlii. sq.

In regard to the literary and theological character of the Book of Wisdom, in its relations to the canonical literature of wisdom in the Old Testament, comp. BRUCH (the work above cited), pp. 322 sq., and GRIMM, in the "*Kurzgef. exeget. Handbuch zu den Apocryphen*," Vol. 6, Introduction; and likewise KUEBEL (Pastor in Würtemberg), "*Die ethischen Grundanschauungen der Weisheit Salomos: ein Beitrag zur Apocryphenfrage*," *Studien und Kritiken*, 1865, IV., pp. 690 sq.

In regard to the book Baruch, see O. F. FRITZSCHE, in the "*Kurzgef. exeg. Handb. zu den Apocr.*," I., 167 sq., and BRUCH, in the work already cited, pp. 319 sq. [Dean STANLEY (*Jewish Church*, II., 272) says of the Book of Wisdom: "It is one link more in the chain by which the influence of Solomon communicated itself to succeeding ages. As the undoubted 'Wisdom,' or Proverbs of Solomon, formed the first expression of the contact of Jewish religion with the philosophy of Egypt and Arabia, so the apocryphal 'Wisdom of Solomon' is the first expression of the contact of Jewish religion with the Gentile philosophy of Greece. Still the apologue and the warning to kings keeps up the old strain; still the old 'wisdom' makes her voice to be heard; and out of the worldly prudence of Solomon springs, for the first time, in distinct terms, 'the hope full of immortality'" (Wisdom i. 1; vi. 1, 9; iii. 1–4; v. 1–5, *etc.*)—A.]

§ 10. SYSTEM OF THE LITERATURE OF WISDOM IN THE OLD TESTAMENT, AND THE RELATIVE PLACE OF THE PROVERBS OF SOLOMON.

So far as the entire literature of wisdom in the Old Testament can be treated as an organic whole, and this whole be viewed as the didactic part of the religious literature of the Old Testament, as distinguished from its other main divisions, we recognize first a classical and a post-classical period [post-heroic, compared by the author to the age of the Epigoni in Greek legend. —A.] as the most strongly marked phases in the course of its development. And within each of these two periods there grows up side by side with gnomic poetry, or the Hhokmah literature in the narrower sense, a similar literature of broader range. In the classical period, or within the bounds of the canonical literature of the Old Testament, the Hhokmah poetry in the strictest sense is represented by the Proverbs of Solomon, with their maxims of wisdom aiming to secure a conception and treatment of nature and of the life of man that shall be conformed to the will of God. Side by side with its profound, concise, vigorous, marrowy sentences we find the glowing delineations and soaring lyrical effusions of Solomon's Song, this glorification of the mystery of love, as it is contemplated from wisdom's point of view. The traditional triple chord in the harmony,—the trilogy in the drama,—of the writings ascribed to Solomon, is completed by the broader reflections to which the Preacher (Ecclesiastes) gives utterance concerning the nothingness of all that is earthly, and the duty of a cheerful but also grateful and devout enjoyment of life. Outside this trilogy, which contains at least one work not im-

Digitized by Google

mediately from Solomon, we find some other products of the Hhokmah literature in the wider sense. There are the didactic Psalms of later date than Solomon, which most resemble the Maschal poetry of the Book of Proverbs, since they are mainly nothing more than gnomes, developed in poetic form. And there is the Book of Job, the dramatic form of whose dialogue is analogous to that of Solomon's Song, while it reveals a certain internal likeness to Ecclesiastes in its devotion to the problems of the day, although at the same time it gives expression to many sceptical thoughts.

Of the productions of the post-classical age, or the literature of wisdom contained in the Jewish Apocrypha, the collection of proverbs by the son of Sirach [Ecclesiasticus], represents the Hhokmah poetry in the narrower sense; for it is a direct imitation of the Proverbs, and in part a later gleaning from the same field. Of the writings which are to be classed here only in the broader sense, the Book of Wisdom stands parallel to Ecclesiastes, and Baruch to the Song of Solomon; still further, if one will, in Tobit a counterpart may be found for Job, and in the Prayer of Manasseh for many of the didactic Psalms.

The Proverbs of Solomon appear therefore, as the central spring and storehouse of the gnomic wisdom of the Old Testament; or, as the true and main trunk of the tree of Hhokmah poetry, widely branching and laden with fruit. And it is mainly on account of this radical impulse, and because of this main trunk, consisting so largely of elements really furnished by Solomon, that the whole development deserves to be called in a general and comprehensive way an intellectual production of the wisest of all kings in Israel.

NOTE 1.—Exhibited in a tabular form the above representation of the literature of wisdom in the Old Testament would stand somewhat as follows,—according to its genetic development and its organic relations:

I. Classical or Hebrew canonical period of the Hhokmah.
  1. Hhokmah poetry in the strictest sense, or in the primitive form of the Maschal (the true gnomic poetry of Solomon):
     The Proverbs.
  2. Hhokmah poetry in the broader sense; or in various transformations and modifications of the primitive type:
     A. The Maschal form transformed to dramatic dialogue:
        a) **Solomon's Song**,—a didactic drama, with strongly marked lyrical and erotic character.
        b) **Job**,—a didactic drama, with a preponderance of the epic character.
     B. The Maschal form expanded in monologue:
        a) **Ecclesiastes**,—a collection of reflective philosophical monologues, constructed from the point of view of the Hhokmah.
        b) The **didactic Psalms**,—specimens of the lyrical development of some fundamental ideas and principles of the Hhokmah.

II. Post-classical period, or Hhokmah literature of the Jewish Apocrypha.
  1. True Hhokmah poetry, with a direct imitation of the old Maschal form:
     Ecclesiasticus.
  2. Hhokmah compositions in the broader sense:
     A. With evident leaning toward the elder literature of the prophetic, or epic and dramatic style:
        a) **Baruch.**
        b) **Tobit.**
     B. With leanings toward elder didactic and lyrical compositions, reflective and philosophical:
        a) The **Wisdom of Solomon.**
        b) The **Prayer of Manasseh.**

NOTE 2.—The grouping of Proverbs, Solomon's Song and Ecclesiastes as a trilogy of compositions by Solomon cannot be critically and chronologically justified. Nevertheless it finds

Digitized by Google

its partial truth and justification in the fact that precisely these three works constitute the normal types of the entire literature of wisdom, in respect both to substance and form (see the Table in note 1). If they be contemplated ideally from this point of view, we cannot refuse to recognize a degree of truth in the old parallel drawn by ORIGEN and JEROME between this trilogy, and the philosophical triad,—*Ethics, Logic, Physics*. Attention has been already called to this in the note to § 1. Compare also page 67 of the General Introduction to the Old Testament section of this Commentary, where the author has given a classification of the writings of Solomon, or, as he puts it, "of the general didactic system of Solomon," which likewise includes the above trilogy.

An analysis of the literature of wisdom in the Old Testament which differs in several points from our own, while it also brings out clearly many correct points of view, is proposed by BRUCH, pp. 67 sq. I. Period before the Exile: *a*) Monuments of the practical philosophy of this period: Proverbs; *b*) Theoretical philosophy: Job; *c*) compositions of partly practical, partly theoretical nature: the older didactic Psalms. II. Period after the exile: *a*) Practical philosophy; Ecclesiasticus; *b*) Theoretical: Solomon's Song; *c*) partly practical, partly theoretical; the later didactic Psalms, and also the Book of Wisdom, which at the same time forms the transition to the Alexandrian philosophy.

By others the apocryphal literature is ordinarily excluded from the classification, and, on the other hand, all the lyrical poetry of the Psalter brought in, so that the result is a classification of all the poetical literature of the Old Testament Canon. See, *e. g.*, HAEVERNICK and KEIL'S *Einleitung*, Vol. III., page 81, where the two great departments of lyrical poetry שִׁיר, and gnomic poetry מָשָׁל are distinguished, and to the first are assigned Psalms, Solomon's Song, and Lamentations,—to the latter, Proverbs, the discourses of Job, and the reflections of Ecclesiastes. FREDERIC SCHLEGEL (*Lectures on the History of Literature*, 4th Lecture), and following him, DELITZSCH (in HERZOG'S "*Real-Encyclopädie*," XIV., 716), propose two main classes of Old Testament writings: 1, historico-prophetic, or books of the history of redemption,—and 2, poetical, or books of aspiration.

The latter class, according to them, includes Job, the Psalter, and the writings of Solomon, and these correspond to the triple chord of faith, hope and love. For Job is designed to maintain faith under trials: the Psalms breathe forth and exhibit hope in the conflict of earth's longings; the writings of Solomon reveal to us the mystery of Divine love, and Proverbs in particular makes us acquainted with that wisdom which grows out of and is eternal love.

With reference to the position to be assigned to Proverbs within the circle of the poetical literature of the Old Testament, these classifications are very instructive. And this is especially true of that last mentioned, which is as evidently correct in its exhibition of the relation of Proverbs to Job and the Psalms, as it is defective with respect to the third of Solomon's writings, Ecclesiastes (which surely has very little to do with "the mystery of Divine love").

In one passage, J. A. BENGEL (in his "*Beiträge zur Schrifterklärung*," edited by Osc. WAECHTER, Leipsic, 1866, p. 27) expresses himself singularly in regard to the significance of the grouping, that has been so long traditional, of Proverbs, Job and Solomon's Song in a trilogy. "The reason why Proverbs, Job and the Canticles stand together in the best Hebrew codices is this,—man standing under paternal discipline needs the Proverbs; when he has passed out from this into the fellowship of suffering he needs Job; after he has been perfected he enters into the *unio mystica* (mystical union) and comprehends Canticles."

B.—SPECIAL INTRODUCTION TO THE PROVERBS OF SOLOMON

§ 11. NAMES OF THE COLLECTION.

The superscription of the book which has been handed down in the Masoretic text, and which rests upon several passages of the book itself (see especially i. 17; x. 1; xxv. 1) is מִשְׁלֵי שְׁלֹמֹה is more correctly rendered, not "Proverbs" (*Sprüchwörter*), but Sayings of Solomon (*Sprüche*).*

* [To speak of the *Proverbs* of Solomon, or any other one man, is, in the strict use of terms, a self-contradiction. A *proverbium*, a *Sprüchwort*, a proverb, is strictly an old and popular saying. Archbishop TRENCH (see Lecture I. in his valuable little work "On the lessons in Proverbs") speaks of "popularity—acceptance and adoption on the part of the people," as "the most essential of all" the qualities of a proverb. A little later he adds, "Herein, in great part, the force

Digitized by Google

This corresponds with the *Παροιμίαι* of the LXX, and the *Parabolæ*, not *Proverbia*, of the Vulgate. For the word מָשָׁל does indeed sometimes describe proverbs in the true sense, or general, practical maxims, growing out of the spirit of a people and expressed in popular form (*e.g.*, 1 Sam. x. 12; Ezek. xvi. 44; xviii. 2). But in itself it signifies only resemblance, likeness (*simile, comparatio, παραβολή, παροιμία*); it is therefore used, according to the peculiarity of Oriental poetry, to designate symbolical or parabolic apothegms, or poetic and philosophical maxims in the widest sense. [The verb מָשַׁל is found with two quite distinct significations—to *command*, and to compare. GESENIUS (*Thesaurus*, s. v.), after proposing two different ways of deriving these from one primary radical meaning, suggests that possibly there are two independent radicals. FUERST regards them as wholly distinct, the primary meaning of the one being "to be strong," of the other "to combine, connect, entwine." Some old commentators erroneously derive the noun from the first of these two verbal roots; *e. g.*, TRAPP (Comm. on Prov., i. 1): "Master sentences; maxims, axioms, speeches of special precellency and predominancy."—A.] Accordingly prophetical predictions (*e. g.*, those of Balaam, Num. xxiii. 7, 18; xxiv. 3; comp. Is. xiv. 4; Mich. ii. 4; Hab. ii. 6), as well as didactic Psalms (*e. g.*, Ps. xlix. 5; lxxviii. 2) or sententious discourses of wise men (*e. g.*, Job xxvii. 1; xxix. 1) are designated as מְשָׁלִים. In the special and predominant sense מָשָׁל is however the designation of a maxim or gnome from within the sphere of the Hhokmah; it is therefore the sentiment or the moral axiom of a Hhakam (see above, §§ 2, 3). For it was just these men, the Hhakamim of the Old Testament economy, that exhibited their main strength in giving utterance to pertinent comparisons, and significant truths of general practical value, and who were accustomed to impart their instructions chiefly in the form of maxims (Prov. i. 7; xxv. 1). An old synonym of the title "Book of Proverbs" or "Proverbs of Solomon" is therefore "Book of Wisdom" סֵפֶר חָכְמָה. [Comp. FUERST's *Kanon des alten Testaments, etc.*, 1868, pp. 73 sq.—A.]. The book probably received this title now and then in the old Hebrew times. At any rate it is so called several times in the Talmud (*e. g.*, Tosephoth to Baba Bathra, f. 14, *b*), and among the earliest Fathers of the Greek Church, like CLEMENT, HEGESIPPUS, IRENÆUS, *etc.*, it received the name *ἡ πανάρετος σοφία* [wisdom including all virtues]. Comp. EUSEBIUS, *Chh. Hist.*, IV., 22, 26, according to whom MELITO of Sardis also gave the book a similar title, *Σολομῶντος παροιμίαι ἡ καὶ Σοφία* [similitudes of Solomon, which is also wisdom]. Compare further the titles *σοφὴ βίβλος* and *παιδαγωγικὴ σοφία* ["the wise book" and "instructive wisdom"] which DIONYSIUS of Alexandria and GREGORY of Nazianzum employ. We may therefore even now give to our collection of Proverbs the title of "Book of Wisdom," as well as the more common designation of "Proverbs." And this is all the more allowable, because this collection is far better entitled to be called a "Book of Wisdom" than the Alexandrian apocryphal work which has assumed the name; it is also far more worthy than Ecclesiastes and Ecclesiasticus, to which old Jewish and Christian works not unfrequently apply the title in question (חָכְמָה, *Σοφία*).

NOTE 1. HAEVERNICK (III. 386) and KEIL (*Introd.*, § 117, p. 396) are in error when they dispute the opinion put forth by BERTHEAU, that the designation of the Proverbs as סֵפֶר חָכְמָה originated among the early Jews. The words of MELITO quoted by EUSEBIUS (passage above cited) are a conclusive proof of the correctness of this view, as they belong to a passage whose express object is to give the designations of the books of the Bible that were current *among the Jews*. Comp. DELITZSCH (work above quoted, p. 712).

NOTE 2. As synonymous with מָשָׁל there occur in the Proverbs of Solomon and elsewhere in the Old Testament the words חִידָה (Prov. i. 6; Ps. xlix. 5; lxxviii. 2; Hab. ii. 6) and מְלִיצָה (Prov.

of a proverb lies, namely, that it has already received the stamp of popular allowance." He calls attention to the Spanish name of the proverb, "*refran*, which is *a referendo*, from the oftenness of its repetition." The probable etymology of *παροιμία*, as "a trite, wayside saying," points the same way.—Dean STANLEY (*Jewish Church*, II., 267), illustrating the same view, says of the Proverbs of Solomon: "They are individual, not national. It is because they represent not many men's wisdom, but one man's supereminent wit, that they produced so deep an impression. They were gifts to the people, not the produce of the people," *etc.* The adage, *adagium*, is of doubtful etymology; probably from "*ad agendum apta.*" The *παραβολή*, from *παρα-βάλλω*, to cast or put beside, is in form a comparison, in purpose an illustration. An instructive and entertaining discussion of this subject, enriched with the amplest illustration, may be found in the *London Quarterly Review*, July, 1868.—A.]

Digitized by Google

i. 6; Hab. ii. 6). The first expression, which properly signifies "enigma" (comp. Judg. xiv. 14; 1 Kings x. 1, *etc.*), [Etym., knotted, involved, intricate, GESEN., FUERST, *etc.*], stands for any dark, involved, profound utterance whatsoever; as in Matth. xiii. 35 the חִידוֹת מִנִּי קֶדֶם is rendered by κεκρυμμένα ἀπὸ καταβολῆς (instead of the προβλήματα ἀπ' ἀρχῆς of the LXX). Compare AUGUSTINE, who uniformly explains *ænigma* by *obscura allegoria:* comp. also LUTHER's "*in einem dunklen Worte*" [through an obscure word] for the phrase ἐν αἰνίγματι ["darkly," Eng. vers.,—" by means of a mirror in riddles," DE WETTE,—" still darkly as in riddles," VAN ESS, ALLIOLI]. If therefore an ethical axiom, a gnome or parable be designated as this חִידָה this is always done with reference to the deeper meaning hidden in it under a figurative veil (comp. in addition to the passages above cited Ezek. xvii. 2). Examples of these enigmatical proverbs [" dark sayings "] in our collection are to be found especially in the " words of Agur," in chap. xxx. Comp. the remarks on xxx. 15, 16.

The meaning of מְלִיצָה is disputed. According to GESENIUS, BERTHEAU, and HITZIG it is equivalent to " interpretation," " discourse requiring interpretation," (comp. the σκοτεινὸς λόγος of the LXX, Prov. i. 6). According to DELITZSCH, HAEVERNICK and KEIL it is "brilliant or pleasing discourse," *oratio splendida, luminibus ornata.*" [FUERST adheres to the derivation first preferred by GESENIUS (following SCHULTENS) according to which לִיץ (obs. in Kal), Arab. لاص signifies " to be involved, entangled," and used of discourse, " to be obscure, and ambiguous,"—and מְלִיצָה " figurative, involved discourse." GESENIUS afterward developed the meaning of the noun from the radical idea of " stammering."—A.]. A sure decision can hardly be reached; the analogy of מֵלִיץ, however, Job xxxiii. 23, Gen. xlii. 23, Isa. xliii. 27, *etc.*, seems to speak for the first interpretation, to which the second may be appended, as appropriate at least for Hab. ii. 6. The radical word is then לִיץ, *torquere*, to twist,—and מְלִיצָה is properly *oratio contorta sive difficilis* [involved or difficult discourse], just as חִידָה (from חוּר *deflectere* [to turn aside]) is properly *oratio obliqua sive per ambages* [oblique or ambiguous discourse].

NOTE 3. With reference to the true conception of the "Proverbs" of Solomon as compared with the proverbs (properly so called) of the Hebrews, and of various other nations, see especially BRUCH, p. 103. " The maxims which are here collected (in the Proverbs) are a product not of the popular spirit of the Hebrews, but of Hebrew wisdom. They have not sprung up unsought, but rather betray deliberate reflection. * * * * They do not lie separate and isolated, like the proverbs of a people, but rest upon certain fundamental conceptions, and together make up a whole. They bear the impress of the Hebrew spirit, but only so far forth as the wise men from whom they come themselves rendered homage to this spirit; in many other respects they rise, as their authors did, essentially above the spirit of the Hebrew nation. They contain rules for conduct in the most diverse conditions of life; but having a bond of connection in general truths, they reach far beyond the sphere of mere experience. Now and then they take a speculative flight, and give utterance to profound conceptions and doctrines of philosophy. * * * * All are clothed in the garb of poetry; every where the law of parallelism prevails in them. That elevation of language which is characteristic of Hebrew poetry is apparent in most of them, while the true *proverbs* of the people are for the most part expressed in prosaic forms, and often in very common language.

It is therefore altogether erroneous to compare this Book of Proverbs with the collections of Arabic proverbs; it might be more fitly compared with the gnomic poetry of the Greeks. It is strictly an *Anthology of Hebrew gnomes.*" Comp. § 2, note 4.

The comparison of the Hebrew Maschal-poetry with the sententious and proverbial poetry of the Arabs, although so peremptorily denied by BRUCH, is not without its justification. See UMBREIT's *Commentary*, Introduction, p. lv., where the two Arabic collections of proverbs, by the grammarian AL MEIDANI († 1141). are named as affording at least some parallels to the Proverbs of Solomon. Reference is made beside to H. A. SCHULTENS' *Anthologia sententiarum Arabicarum* (Leyden, 1772), and to the collections of ERPENIUS, GOLIUS, KALLIUS, *etc.* (in

Digitized by Google

SCHNURRER'S *Bibliotheca Arabica*, pp. 210–221) as furnishing such parallels in rich abundance. The latest and best edition of these collections of Arabic proverbs is that of FREYTAG, *Arabum proverbia sententiæque proverbiales*, Bonn, 1838-43, which not only contains entire the collection of MEIDANI numbering above 9,000 proverbs, but also gives information concerning the 29 collections of gnomes existing in Arabic literature before MEIDANI. Comp. also HAEVERNICK and KEIL, III., 381 sq., and BLEEK'S Introduction, p. 632, where among other things an interesting observation of AL MEIDANI is given, with reference to the great value of the proverbial wisdom; "acquaintance with proverbs does not merely adorn with their beauties all circles of society, and grace the inhabitants whether of cities or of the desert; it imparts brilliancy to the contents of books, and by the allusions which are hidden in them sweetens the words of the preacher and teacher. And why should it not? since even the word of God, the Koran, is interwoven with them,—the discourses of the Prophet contain them,—the most eminent scholars, who have trodden the path of a mysterious wisdom have won this knowledge as their friend?" "Proverbs are to the soul what a mirror is to the eyes." Manifestly it is not common popular proverbs to which this enthusiastic praise refers, but maxims from the schools of the sages, and of a poetic, philosophic character, similar to those of the Old Testament, though mainly of far inferior worth. (This is pertinent also as a reply to DELITZSCH, p. 694, who following EWALD, declares the comparison of the Hebrew with the Arabic collections of proverbs altogether inadmissible).

§ 12. ORIGIN AND COMPOSITION OF THE COLLECTION.

The collection of the Proverbs of Solomon in its present form opens with a long superscription, which, in the style of oriental titles, praises the whole book for its important and practically useful contents. This is followed by three main divisions of the book, of unequal length and distinguished by separate titles, to which are appended two supplements. The *first* main division (chap. i.—ix.) subdivided into three sections (chaps. i.—iii., iv.—vii., viii.—ix.) contains an exhibition of wisdom as the highest good to be attained. To the attainment and preservation of this in the face of the dangers that threaten the possession of it,—sensuality, impurity, adultery, *etc.*,—youth in particular are admonished: and this is done in the form of instructions or admonitions, somewhat prolonged, and having an inward connection of parts, addressed by a father to his son,—and not in brief, aphoristically separated maxims.

The *second* main division (chap. x.—xxiv.) again comprises three sections, not symmetrical but of quite unequal length; *a*) chaps. x. 1—xxii. 16, with the superscription מִשְׁלֵי שְׁלֹמֹה; a collection of separate, loosely connected, and for the most part very short maxims, which in part depict wisdom and the fear of God, and in part folly and sin, according to their chief manifestations and results; and this they do without rigid adherence to a fixed train of ideas, with so loose a coherence of the individual sentences that either no connection of thought appears, or one merely external, brought about by certain characteristic words or terms of expression.

b) chap. xxii. 17—xxiv. 22; a Maschal introduced by a special injunction to hearken to the words of the wise (chap. xxii. 17—19), quite well connected in its parts, and evidently forming one whole; this contains various prescriptions of equity and worldly prudence.

c) chap. xxiv. 23—34; a short appendix, which by its superscription גַּם אֵלֶּה לַחֲכָמִים ["these also are the words of the wise"], is described as the work of various wise men, no longer definitely known; it consists of some maxims which, although nearly all having the form of commands or prohibitions, have no internal mutual connection.

Then follows the *third* main division (chap. xxv.—xxix.) having the superscription, "These also are proverbs of Solomon, which the men of Hezekiah, the King of Judah, collected:"—a collection of single, loosely grouped proverbs, among which are found an unusually large number of pointed comparisons and antitheses.

The two supplements of the collection are, 1) chap. xxx. "The words of Agur the son of Jakeh," a compilation of maxims distinguished by their peculiarly artificial garb, and the partial obscurity of their meaning; 2) chap. xxxi. bearing the superscription "Words of Lemuel the king of Massa, which his mother taught him."* Under this title (in regard to which we shall soon have

* [For the various explanations of the verse see Comm. on xxxi. 1].

Digitized by Google

more to say) the chapter contains *a*) a series of maxims for kings, and *b*) the praise of a virtuous matron, which is clothed in the form of an alphabetic song (vers. 10-31).

That the collection as a whole is not the immediate work of Solomon, or in other words, that the introductory words of the first superscription (chap. i. 1) "Proverbs of Solomon, son of David, king of Israel," so far as they relate to the whole, design to claim the authorship for Solomon only in the most general sense, appears from the most hasty glance at our abstract of the contents. For apart from the fact that at the opening of the second main division there is a repetition of the title "Proverbs of Solomon,"—the last divisions, from xxii. 17 onward, are introduced by quite different superscriptions, two of which refer vaguely to "wise men" as the authors of the respective sections, and two to definite persons (although these are otherwise unknown), while the one which contains again the expression "Proverbs of Solomon" designates as the "collectors" of these "Proverbs of Solomon" the "men" of a king of Judah who did not live until 300 years after Solomon. [FUERST'S inference from these diverse superscriptions and appellations is thus stated (*Canon des alten Testaments*, p. 74); "that it is not the originating of all the proverbs with Solomon that was emphasized, though he be regarded as their main source, but only the aim and effect of the proverbs to promote wisdom."—Dean STANLEY, (*ubi supra*, p. 268) says "as in the case of the word 'wisdom,' the connection of 'Proverbs' with Solomon can be traced by the immense multiplication of the word after his time."—A.]. And not only these diverse superscriptions, but various peculiarities of language, style, *etc.*, such as present themselves to the attentive observer in each section in a characteristic way, bear witness to the gradual growth of the collection under the hands of several authors of a later day than Solomon's, each complementing the rest. We might put the whole work of compilation to the account of the "men of Hezekiah," (chap. xxv. 1), and so assume that the maxims of Solomon, before scattered, and transmitted in part orally, in part by less complete written records, were collected, and, with the addition of sundry supplements brought into their present form by certain wise men from the court of the devout king Hezekiah (B. C. 727—697). The verb הֶעְתִּיקוּ which in the passage cited above is used to describe the agency of these men, would well accord with this assumption; for it signifies, not "appended" (LUTHER), but "brought together, arranged in order," in as much as הֶעְתִּיק properly means "to remove from its place, to set or place somewhere;" and in the passage before us it is rendered correctly by the ἐξεγράψαντο of the LXX, and the *transtulerunt* of the Vulgate. But the relations of the matter are not quite so simple that the whole compilation and revision can be referred to these wise men of Hezekiah. For from the quite numerous repetitions of whole proverbs, or at least parts of proverbs from earlier sections, such as occur in the division chaps. xxv.—xxix. (compare *e. g.*, xxv. 24 with xxi. 9,—xxvi. 22 with xviii. 8,—xxvii. 12 with xxii. 3,—xxvii. 21 with xvii. 3,—xxix. 22 with xv. 18, *etc.*) it seems altogether probable that the preceding sections existed as an independent whole, before the attachment of chaps. xxv. sq. This is confirmed by the fact that certain characteristics noticeable in the structure of clause and verse, and many peculiarities of phraseology and idiom likewise indicate that between the sections preceding chap. xxv. and the last seven chapters a wide difference exists, and one that points to the greater antiquity of the first and largest division. Hezekiah's wise men appear therefore substantially as supplementing, or more exactly as continuing and imitating a larger collection of Solomon's proverbs already in existence before their day: and the existence of this they must not only have known but studiously regarded, for the great majority of the maxims and axioms there found they did not take into their new collection, but sought to present that which was mainly new and independent; in consequence however of the similarity of the sources from which they drew to those of the earlier collection, they could not but reproduce much in a similar form, and some things in a form exactly corresponding with the earlier. [The Jewish tradition as given by FUERST (*ubi supra*, p. 75) ascribes the collection of the proverbs of the first three sections, chaps. i.—ix., x.—xxii. 16, and xxii. 17—xxiv. to the men of Hezekiah. And it finds this view confirmed by the very fact that the next section begins (xxv. 1) with the words "*These also*, are proverbs," *etc.* But the subsequent collection (chap. xxv. sq. is "continued" by them, the proverbs being searched out elsewhere and transferred to this place; "proverbs not hitherto publicly employed for the education of the peo-

Digitized by Google

ple they brought into a collection, to be in like manner used as a collection of Solomon's proverbs." The "men of Hezekiah" he regards moreover as not all contemporaries and agents of the good king, but as organized into a "college," continued for literary, religious, and judicial purposes 280 years, seven full generations. This is Jewish tradition.—A.].

That the older collection is not however to be itself regarded as all of one casting, but likewise as a product of the activity of one or several editors collecting and combining from still earlier sources, appears from several facts. Within this section, as well as the later, instances occur of the repetition of single proverbs in an identical or analogous form (comp. *e. g.* xiv. 12 with xvi. 25,—xvi. 2 with xxi. 2,—x. 2 with xi. 4,—xiii. 14 with xvi. 27,—xix. 12 with xx. 2, *etc.*). We have, besides, this fact, which is still more significant, that here again a diversity appears, marked by decided peculiarities of form as well as substance, between the two large subdivisions, chaps. i.—ix., and chaps. x. 1—xxii. 16. In the second of these sections we find mainly verses symmetrically constructed,—so-called "antithetic couplets,"—and each verse presents an idea quite complete and intelligible. It is the simplest and, as it were, the ideal type of the Maschal that here predominates; and since the simplest is wont to be as a general rule the most primitive, this fact suggests the conjecture that we are dealing here simply with genuine, original proverbs of Solomon. In other words, *Chapters x.—xxii.* 16 *comprise the proper germ of the gnomic poetry of the Old Testament, which is in the strictest sense to be referred to Solomon and his age.* In the two supplements to this central main division, chap. xxii. 17—xxiv. 22, and chap. xxiv. 23—34 we observe in respect to form quite another character in the individual proverbs, although in their ethical tenor and substance they correspond with the preceding. They lose something of the telling, pointed brevity, the inward richness of meaning, the condensed power, that characterize the earlier proverbs; and instead of "the rapid alternation of clause and counter-clause" before every where perceptible, there is apparent here less uniformity of structure, and an effort to expand the brief axiom to the longer discourse, admonitory, didactic, or illustrative of some moral truth. Still more entirely is the simple and beautiful form of the Maschal, compact, pithy and symmetrical, disregarded and cast aside in chaps. i.—ix. These present nothing but longer admonitory discourses, moral pictures full of warning, and ethico-religious contemplations of broader compass, in all of which the simple, short proverb is only exceptional, and "proverbial poetry evidently took the form of admonition and preaching, but for this very reason became much more flexible, flowing and comprehensible." The technical language of the Hhokmah appears here in various ways expanded and refined,—especially in the application of such full allegorical delineations as are contained in chap. ix. (in the description of Wisdom's house with its seven pillars, and her feast,—and also in that of the conduct of the אֵשֶׁת כְּסִילוּת the personification of Folly). The nearly equal length, moreover, of the three sections into which this entire admonitory address to youth is divided, (see the earlier part of the §), the quite regular and frequent recurrence of the בְּנִי, "my son," which shows this to be its chief application, (i. 8; ii. 1; iii. 1, 11, 21; iv. 10, 20; v. 1, *etc.*), the adherence to certain leading thoughts through all the change and variety in expression and delineation,—all this points us to a single author, who different as he was from the author of the collection following (x. 1—xxii. 16), designed to furnish an appropriate introduction to this collection of older proverbs, and to commend it to the Israel of his own time, especially to its younger generation.

That the mutual relations of the various parts of the Book of Proverbs are to be judged substantially in this way, most of the recent commentators are agreed. [This general view both of the structure and authorship of our book is taken by most of our English and American scholars, with some divergencies of course, in the details. Thus, STUART, NOYES, MUENSCHER, W. ALDIS WRIGHT, *etc.* STUART sums up his view of the authorship thus (Comm. p. 63): "Solomon selected many, composed others, and put together those which he judged to be true, most striking, and most worthy to be preserved. . . . . It matters not how much of the book of Proverbs Solomon actually composed; we only need his sanction to what it now contains." Portions of the book moreover do not even purport to be Solomon's.—A.]. We may make an exception, perhaps, of H. A. HAHN, HAEVERNICK, and KEIL, who, in spite of all internal and external differences between the several sections, which they are forced to acknowledge,—in spite of the va-

Digitized by Google

rious introductory superscriptions,—still feel constrained to maintain Solomon's immediate authorship of the whole, with the sole exception of the two supplements in chaps. xxx., xxxi. (see especially HAEVERNICK and KEIL'S *Introduction*, III., 392 sq.). [This is WORDSWORTH'S position. It is moreover characteristic of him to look on the proverbs as having "also a typical character and inner spiritual significance, concerning heavenly doctrines of supernatural truth." He finds support for this view in the fact that the collection is in its introduction said expressly to comprise enigmas and dark sayings.—A.]. Inasmuch as this conclusion is made necessary neither by reasons, internal or external, [in the book itself], nor by any general theological interest in maintaining the inspired character of Scriptures, we must, unquestionably, adopt one of those views which represent the present collection as growing up gradually in the time between Solomon and Hezekiah, or even within a period ending somewhat later, and which discriminate between an original nucleus that is from Solomon, and the accretions of various ages, which are due to later collectors and editors.

The more important of these theories are (1) that of EWALD (*Poet. Bücher des Alten Test.*, IV. 2 sq.). According to this, chap. x. 1—xxii. 16 forms the earliest collection, originating perhaps two hundred years after Solomon, yet inspired throughout by Solomon's spirit; to this were appended, first, in Hezekiah's time chap. xxv.—xxix., which also contain much that is the genuine work of Solomon,—then, in the following century, the Introduction, chap. i.—ix.,—then the supplements to the central main division, chap. xxii. 17—xxiv. 34,—and lastly the supplements chaps. xxx., xxxi; and all these last are to be regarded as the independent composition of unknown sages of the later period before the exile, without any elements whatever that are Solomon's.

We have (2) the view of BERTHEAU (*Commentary, Introd.*, pp. xxiii. sq.). According to this it is as impossible to demonstrate with certainty an origin earlier than the days of Hezekiah for the second collection (chap. x. 1—xxii. 16) as for the first (chap. i.—ix.), the third (chap. xxii. 17—xxiv. 34), or the fourth (chap. xxv.—xxix.); we must therefore in general maintain the merely negative conclusion, that the book of Proverbs in its present form originated after the time of Solomon, and that it flowed from sources oral and written that are perhaps very numerous. We have (3) the view of HITZIG ("*Das Königreich Massa*" in ZELLER'S *Theol. Jahrb.* 1844, pp. 269 sq., and *Commentary*, Introd. pp. xvii. sq.). This represents the present order of the parts as substantially that of their composition. It accordingly conceives of the first collection (chaps. i. —ix.) as originating pretty soon after Solomon, in the 9th century B. C.; it then appends to this, shortly before the times of Hezekiah, or in the first half of the 8th century, the second (chap. x. 1—xxii. 16) together with the latter part of the fourth (chap. xxviii. 17—xxix. 27); to this it attaches "in the last quarter of the 8th century" the anthology in chaps. xxv.—xxvii., and about a hundred years later (at the beginning of the period following the exile) the intruded section, chap. xxii. 17—xxiv. 34, and the fragment, chap. xxviii. 1—16; finally, at a still later day it adds the supplements in chaps. xxx, xxxi.

We have (4) the view of DELITZSCH (in HERZOG'S *Encycl.*, as above quoted, especially pp. 707 sq.), with which that developed by BLEEK (*Introd.*, pp. 634 sq.) agrees in the main point,—*i. e.*, apart from some subordinate details in which it approaches more nearly the theory of EWALD. According to this the first and largest section of the Book of Proverbs (chap. i. 1—xxiv. 22) comes from an age earlier than Hezekiah, the second and smaller commencing with xxiv. 23, from Hezekiah's times. The compiler of the first half lived possibly under Jehoshaphat, within a century of Solomon. As material for the middle and main division of this work,—the germ, the main trunk, consisting of the genuine proverbial wisdom of Solomon as contained in chap. x. 1—xxii 16,—he availed himself above all of the rich treasures of the 3,000 proverbs of Solomon, which were undoubtedly all fully preserved to his day, and from which he may be assumed to have taken at least all that were of religious and ethical value. Still he appears to have gathered up much that is not from Solomon, and therefore to have united in one collection the noblest and richest fruits of the proverbial poetry of the wise king, with the most valuable of the "side shoots which the Maschal poetry put forth, whether from the mouth of the people or the poets of that day." To this collection he prefixed the long Introduction in chaps. i.—ix.; a monument of his high poetic inspiration, not in the strict form of the Maschal, but that of long poetic admonitions,—in which he dedicated the whole work to the instruction of youth. At the same

Digitized by Google

time he added an appendix, chap. xxii. 17—xxiv. 22, consisting of proverbs from various wise men, and commencing with an apostrophe to youth (chap. xxii. 17—21) the tone of which reminds one of the longer Introduction.

While according to this view the first and larger section purports to be essentially a book for youth, the second and shorter division, whose nucleus is formed by the proverbs of Solomon compiled by the men of Hezekiah, is evidently a book for the people, a treasury of proverbial wisdom for kings and subjects,—as is indicated by the first, introductory proverb: "It is the glory of God to conceal a thing, and the honor of kings to search out a matter." After the analogy of the first collection, to these proverbs gathered by Hezekiah (or this treasury of "Solomon's wisdom in Hezekiah's days," in STIER's apt phrase), a sort of introduction was prefixed, chap. xxiv. 23–34, and a supplement was added, consisting of the proverbial discourses of Agur and Lemuel, and the poem in praise of a virtuous matron, in chap. xxx., xxxi. Thus, like the older collection of the proverbs of Solomon, this made by Hezekiah has "proverbs of wise men on the right and on the left;" "the king of proverbial poetry stands here also in the midst of a worthy retinue." As to the time of the origin of the second collection, we are indeed not to assume the reign of Hezekiah itself, but the next subsequent period. The personality of the collector of this second main division stands far more in the background than that of the author of the first, larger collection, who in its introductory chapters has given rich proofs of his own poetical endowments and his wisdom. From which of the two the general superscription of the whole, chap. i. 1–6, has come, must remain a question; yet it is from internal evidence more probable that it was the last collector who prefixed this to the book.

We have presented with especial fullness this hypothesis of DELITZSCH in regard to the origin of the Book of Proverbs, because it is in itself the most attractive of all, and offers the most satisfactory explanation of the various phenomena that arrest the attention of the observant reader, as he considers the superscriptions and the internal peculiarities of the several parts. It is less forced and artificial than the theory of HITZIG, which shows itself arbitrary and hypercritical, especially in breaking up the section, chap. xxv.—xxix.; and it does not rest content with the mere negative results of criticism, like the analysis of BERTHEAU, which is also chargeable with excess of critical sharpness. In comparison with EWALD's hypothesis it has the advantage, that it rests upon a more correct conception of the order of the development of gnomic poetry among the ancient Hebrews. For it rejects as a one-sided and arbitrary dictum, EWALD's axiom, that the antithetic verse of two members which predominates in chap. x. 1—xxii. 16, is the oldest form of the Maschal, and that all proverbs and gnomic discourses otherwise constructed, by their departure from the typical form betray their origin as decidedly later than the days of Solomon. It accordingly allows that sections in which there is a preponderance of gnomic discourses and gnomic songs,—such as chap. i.—ix. and xxii. 17—xxiv. 22, may come, if not from Solomon himself, at least from the age immediately after Solomon. It likewise recognizes in the collection that dates from Hezekiah's day proverbial poetry which is mainly the genuine work of Solomon, or at least stands very near his day, and whose artistic character by no means (as EWALD thinks) contains traces of a decay in purity and beauty of form that is already quite far advanced.

Only in this particular are we unable altogether to agree with DELITZSCH, that he would find in chap. x.—xxii. together with a selection from the 3,000 proverbs of Solomon, much that is his only in a secondary sense. We believe rather that it is just this main division which contains nothing but fruits of Solomon's gnomic wisdom in the narrowest and strictest sense, and that repetitions of individual proverbs within the section, which are partly identical and partly approximative, in which especially DELITZSCH thinks he finds support for the view that we are now combating, are to be otherwise explained. They are, like the repetitions of discourses of Christ in the Gospels, to be partly charged to diversity in the sources or channels of the later oral or written tradition, and in part recognized as real tautologies or repetitions which the wise king now and then allowed himself. We should, on the other hand, be disposed rather to conjecture, that in the supplements, chap. xxii. 17—xxiv. 34, which are expressly described as "words of wise men," and perhaps also in Hezekiah's collection, chap. xxv.—xxix., there is no inconsiderable number of utterances of wise men of Solomon's time, such as Heman, Ethan, Chalkol, *etc.;* and

Digitized by Google

this simply for the reason, that the superscriptions דִּבְרֵי חֲכָמִים (xxii. 17) [words of wise men], and גַּם אֵלֶּה לַחֲכָמִים (xxiv. 23) [these also are from wise men], together with the peculiarity of diction which points to a high antiquity, make such a conjecture reasonable. The short section beginning with the superscription last cited, chap. xxiv. 23–34, we should be most inclined, in concurrence with the majority of expositors, to regard as a second appendix to the first main collection, because the assumption of DELITZSCH that it is a sort of Introit to the second main division, of the same age as the section, chap. xxv.—xxix., strikes us in no other way than as too bold and destitute of all adequate foundation.

It remains only to speak briefly of the superscriptions to the two supplements in chapters xxx., xxxi. The "Agur, son of Jakeh" (?) to whom the contents of chapter xxx. are accredited, is a wise man otherwise altogether unknown, whose era we are as unable to determine with certainty as his residence, whose very name is almost as difficult and uncertain in its interpretation as are the words next succeeding in chapter xxx. 1. הַמַּשָּׂא נְאֻם הַגֶּבֶר לְאִיתִיאֵל לְאִיתִיאֵל וְאֻכָל. Perhaps instead of the common translation of these words: "the prophetic address of the man to Ithiel, to Ithiel and Ucal" ["even the prophecy; the man spake unto Ithiel, even unto Ithiel and Ucal," E. V.], the interpretation of HITZIG, adopted also by BERTHEAU, HAHN and DELITZSCH, should be followed. According to this, the words בִּן יָקֶה ["son of Jakeh"] by a change of punctuation are to be connected closely with the word הַמַּשָּׂא; thus for the beginning of the whole superscription we reach this meaning: "Words of Agur, the son of her whose dominion is Massa" (בֶּן יְקָהָהּ מַשָּׂא), *i. e.*, son of the queen of Massa. This queen of Massa we should then have to regard as the same person who in the superscription to the next supplement (chap. xxxi.) is designated as the "mother of King Lemuel." For in this passage also מַשָּׂא must be regarded as the name of a country, and the מֶלֶךְ מַשָּׂא [King of Massa] as perhaps an Israelitish Arab, or, as DELITZSCH suggests, an Ishmaelitish prince, whose kingdom, to judge from the mention of it in Gen. xxv. 14; 1 Chron. i. 30, must have lain in Northern Arabia, and whose brother would have been the Agur in question. [FUERST (*ubi supra*, pp. 76–7) regards מַשָּׂא as a common noun, singular in form, but collective in import, having the meaning common in the prophets, "a prophetic or inspired utterance." The symbolical meaning found here by Jewish tradition may be reserved for the exegetical notes on this chapter.—A.] Further arguments in support of this interpretation (first presented by HITZIG in the Articles in ZELLER'S *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1844, cited above, and adopted, although with various modifications, by the other interpreters whom we have named), and in reply to all conflicting interpretations, will be brought forward in the special exegesis of the passages involved. We shall there have occasion to discuss the further question, whether the whole substance of chap. xxx. is to be referred to Agur, and all in chap. xxxi. to Lemuel, or whether at least the Alphabetic poem in praise of a virtuous matron must not be regarded (as is done by nearly all the recent commentators) as the work of another author.

§ 13. THE RELATION OF THE MASORETIC TEXT OF THE COLLECTION TO THE ALEXANDRIAN.

In the LXX there occur many, and in some instances very remarkable deviations from the common Hebrew text of the Proverbs. These consist in glosses to many obscure passages (*i. e.*, either in readings that are actually correct and primitive, as, *e. g.*, xi. 24; xii. 6; xv. 28; xviii. 1; xix. 28; xxi. 6, 28, *etc.*, or in wild emendations, as in xii. 12; xviii. 19; xix. 25; xxiv. 10, *etc.*), in completing imperfect sentences (as, *e. g.*, xi. 16; xvi. 17; xix. 7), in independent additions or interpolations (*e. g.*, after i. 18; iii. 15; iv. 27; vi. 8, 11; viii. 21; ix. 6, 10, 12; xii. 13; xiii. 13, 15, *etc.*), in double versions of one and the same proverb (*e. g.*, xii. 12; xiv. 22; xv. 6; xvi. 26; xvii. 20; xviii. 8; xxii. 8, 9; xxix. 7, 25; xxxi. 27, in the omission of whole verses (*e. g.*, i. 16; xvi. 1, 3; xxi. 5; xxiii. 23, *etc.*), and finally in the transposition of entire passages of greater length. Accordingly, of the proverbs of Agur, the first half (chap. xxx. 1–14) is inserted after chap. xxiv. 22, and the second, chap. xxx. 15–33, together with the words of King Lemuel, after xxiv. 34; the two supplements, therefore with the exception of the praise of the excellent matron (chap. xxxi. 10 sq.) appear associated with the "words of wise men" which stand between the elder and the later collection of proverbs.

Digitized by Google

These deviations are so considerable that they compel the assumption that there were quite early two different recensions of the Book of Proverbs, one belonging to Palestine, the other to Egypt, the former of which lies at the basis of the Masoretic text, the latter, of the Alexandrian version. The Egyptian text appears in general to abound more in corruptions and arbitrary alterations of the original; sometimes, however, it preserves the original most correctly, and seems to have drawn from primitive sources containing the genuine proverbial wisdom of Solomon. Especially is it true that not a few of the additions which it exhibits on a comparison with the Hebrew text, breathe a spirit, bold and lofty, as well as thoughtful and poetic (see, *e. g.*, iv. 27; ix. 12; xii. 13; xix. 7, *etc.*); these appear, therefore, as fruits grown on the stock of the noble poetry of wisdom among the ancient Hebrews,—in part even as pearls from the rich treasures of Solomon's 3,000 proverbs (1 Kings iv. 32).

NOTE 1.—The critical gain for the emendation of the text and for the interpretation of the Book of Proverbs that is yielded by the parallels of the LXX may be found most carefully tested and noted—though not without many instances of hypercritical exaggeration and arbitrary dealing—in FR. BÖTTCHER'S "*Neue exegetisch kritische Aehrenlese zum A. T.*," III., pp. 1–39; in P. DE LAGARDE'S "*Anmerkungen zur griechischen Uebersetzung der Proverbien*" (Leipz., 1863); in M. HEIDENHEIM'S Article, "*Zur Textkritik der Proverbien*" (*Deutsche Vierteljahrsschr. für englisch-theol. Forschung*, u. s. w., VIII., Gotha, 1865, pp. 395 sq.); as well as in the Commentaries of BERTHEAU (see especially Introd., pp. xlv. sq.) and HITZIG (Introd., pp. xix. sq.; xxiii. sq.). The last mentioned writer has also thoroughly discussed the variations of the Syriac version (Peschito), the Vulgate and the Targum (pp. xxvii. sq.); of these, however, in general, only the first named are of any considerable critical value, and that usually only in the cases where they agree with those of the LXX.

Compare furthermore the earlier works of J. G. JAEGER, *Observationes in Provv. Salom. versionem Alexandrinam*, Lips., 1786; SCHLEUSSNER, *Opuscula critica ad versiones Græcas V. T. pertinentia*, Lips., 1812, pp. 260 sq.; and also DATHE, *De ratione consensus versionis Chaldaicæ et Syriacæ proverbiorum Salomonis* (in *Dathii Opuscc.* ed. ROSENMUELLER, pp. 106 sq.).

NOTE 2.—UMBREIT in his Commentary has taken special notice of several other ancient Greek versions beside the LXX, especially the *Versio Veneta*, which is for the most part strictly literal. Another text which is likewise quite literal, which PROCOPIUS used in his Ἑρμήνεια εἰς τὰς παροιμίας, and which ANGELO MAI has edited in Tom. IX. of his *Class. Auctor.*, may be found noticed in HEIDENHEIM (as above).

§ 14. THE POETICAL FORM OF PROVERBS.

The simplest form of the Maschal, or the technical form of poetry among the Hebrews, is a verse consisting of two short symmetrically constructed clauses,—the so-called distich (*Zweizeiler*,)as DELITZSCH calls it, following EWALD'S peculiarly thorough investigations on the subject before us. The mutual relation of the two members or lines of this kind of verse shapes itself very variously, in accordance with the general laws for the structure of Hebrew poetry. There are *synonymous* distichs, in which the second line repeats the meaning of the first in a form but slightly changed, for the sake of giving as clear and exhaustive a presentation as possible of the thought involved (*e. g.*, xi. 7, 25; xii. 28; xiv. 19; xv. 3, 10, 12, *etc.*). There are *antithetic* distichs, in which the second illustrates by its opposite the truth presented in the first (*e. g.*, x. 1 sq.; xi. 1 sq.; xii. 1 sq.; xv. 1 sq.). There are *synthetic* distichs, the two halves of which express truths of different yet kindred import (*e. g.*, x. 18, 24, *etc.*). There are *integral* (*eingedankige*) distichs, in which the proposition commenced in the first half is brought to completion only by the second, the thought which is to be presented extending through the two lines (as in xi. 31; xiv. 7, 10; xvi. 4, 10; xxii. 28). There are finally *parabolic* distichs, *i. e.*, maxims which in some form or other exhibit comparisons between a moral idea and an object in nature or common life: and this is effected sometimes by כְּ [as] in the first clause and כֵּן [so] in the second, that is, in the form natural to comparisons,—sometimes, and more usually, in such a way that the proposed object and its counterpart are set loosely side by side, with a suggestive, emblematic brevity, with or without the copulative וְ (xi. 22; xvii. 3; xxv. 25; xxvi. 23; xxvii. 21, *etc.*). In the central main division of the collection, chap. x.—xxii. 16, all the proverbs are these short distichs, and, as has been already

Digitized by Google

said, the larger part of them (especially in the first six chapters of the section) *antithetic* distichs, distinguished by the "but" (Hebr. ו) at the beginning of the second line (compare § 12, p. 27, and below, § 15). In the supplements to the oldest collection (xxii. 17—xxiv. 34) as well as in the gleanings of Hezekiah's men, there are found however not a few instances of the extension of the simple typical distich to a verse of several lines, or of the multiplication of the couplet to four-, six- or eight-lined verses.*

In the case of these longer proverbs, which comprise several verses, we find repeated, if not every one, yet the greater part of the diverse relations of the first to the second half of the proverb, which we had observed in the distichs. There are, it is true, no antithetic stanzas of four lines,—but there are *synonymous verses* (*e.g.*, xxiii. 15 sq.; xxiv. 3 sq.; xxiv. 28 sq.),—*synthetic* (xxx. 5 sq.),—stanzas with a *single idea* (xxii. 22 sq., 26 sq.; xxx. 17 sq.),—and *parabolic* verses (xxvi. 18 sq.; xxv. 4 sq.). Specimens of the six-lined stanzas (which are constructed mainly with a single thought, or in the synthetic form) are to be found, *e.g.*, in xxiii. 1–3, 12–14, 19–21, 26–28; xxiv. 11–12; xxx. 29–31. Verses 22–25 of chapter xxiii. compose a stanza of eight lines, synthetic in its structure. Side by side with this normal multiplication of the couplet to form stanzas of four, six or eight lines, there are abnormal or one-sided growths, resulting in triplets, with the first division of two lines and the second of one (*e.g.*, xxii. 29; xxiv. 8; xxvii. 22; xxviii. 10, *etc.*),—or in stanzas of five lines (xxiii. 4 sq.; xxv. 6 sq.; xxx. 32 sq.), or in stanzas of seven lines, of which at least one example appears in chap. xxiii. 6–8.

If the proverb extends itself beyond the compass of seven or eight lines, it becomes the Maschal (or *gnomic*) poem, without a fixed internal order for the strophes. Such a poem (or song) is, for example, the introductory paragraph [of one main division], chap. xxii. 17–21; and again, the meditation on the drunkard, xxiii. 29-35; that on the lazy husbandman, xxiv. 30–34; the admonition to diligence in husbandry, xxvii. 23-27; the prayer for the happy medium between poverty and riches, xxx. 7–9; the prince's mirror, xxxi. 2–9, and the alphabetically constructed song in praise of the matron, xxxi. 10–31.

The introductory main division, chap. i. 7—ix. 18, consists wholly of these proverbial poems, and of 15 of them (see in § 16 the more exact enumeration of these 15 subdivisions, which may again be classed in three larger groups). Inasmuch as the rhetorical presentation throws the poetical in these cases usually quite into the background, these Maschal poems may almost be called with greater propriety Maschal discourses. Yet within these there is no lack of poetical episodes, lofty and artistic in their structure, among which we would name especially the allegory of the banquet of Wisdom and Folly (chap. ix. 1 sq.), and also the numerical proverb in eight lines concerning "the six things which the Lord hates and the seven that are an abomination to Him" (in chap. vi. 16–19). Of these numerical proverbs, or מִדּוֹת, as they are called in the poetry of the later Judaism, chap. xxx., as is well known, contains several (vers. 7 sq., 15 sq., 18 sq., 21 sq., 24 sq.). In the Son of Sirach's collection of proverbs likewise we find several examples of the same kind (*e.g.*, Ecclesiasticus xxiii. 16; xxv. 7; xxvi. 5, 28). Further observations on the origin and import of this peculiar poetic form may be found in notes on chap. vi. 16. Now and then the Book of Proverbs contains forms analogous to the *Priamel* [*præambulum*, a peculiar type of epigram, found in German poetry of the 14th and 15th centuries—A.]; see, *e.g.*, xx. 10; xxv. 3; xxvi. 12; xxx. 11–14; yet this form is hardly found except in the most imperfect state.

The last of the technical forms of the poetry of the Book of Proverbs is that of the Maschal-series, *i. e.*, a sequence of several proverbs relating to the same objects, *e.g.*, the series of proverbs concerning the fool, chap. xxvi. 1-12,—the sluggard, xxvi. 13–16,—the brawler, xxvi. 20–22,—the

* [In English Biblical literature, Bishop LOWTH's discussion and classification has been the basis generally assumed. We know no clearer and more concise exhibition of this system and the various modifications that have been proposed than that given by W. ALDIS WRIGHT in SMITH's *Dictionary of the Bible* (Article *Poetry*, *Hebrew*). LOWTH who is closely followed by STUART, EDWARDS and others, regards a triple classification as sufficient: *synonymous*, *antithetic* and *synthetic* parallelisms. An infelicity in the term *synonymous*, in view of the extent and variety of its applications, was recognized by LOWTH himself, but more strongly urged by Bishop JEBB, who proposed the term *cognate*. This appears to be a real improvement in terms. MUENSCHER (Introd., pp. xlv. sq.) proposes two additional classes, the *gradational* and the *introverted*, the first of which is well covered by the term *cognate*, while the second, which had been proposed by JEBB, seems open to WRIGHT's exception, that it is "an unnecessary refinement." This objection does not seem to lie against the new terms proposed in ZÖCKLER's nomenclature.—A.]

Digitized by Google

spiteful, xxvi. 23–27. This form belongs, however, as DELITZSCH correctly observes, "rather to the technical form of the collection than to the technical form of the poetry of proverbs." That the former [the arrangement] is far more imperfect and bears witness to far greater indifference than the latter,—in other words, that the logical construction, the systematic arrangement of individual proverbs according to subjects, especially within the central main division, is far from satisfactory, and baffles almost completely all endeavors to discover a definite scheme,—this must be admitted as an indisputable fact, just in proportion as we give fit expression on the other hand to our admiration at the wealth of forms, expressive, beautiful and vigorous, which the collection exhibits in its details.

NOTE.—With reference to the connection of the several proverbs one with another, and also with respect to the progress of thought apparent in the collection as a whole, we can by no means concur in the opinion of J. A. BENGEL,—at least in regard to the main divisions, x. 1 sq.; xxii. 17 sq.; xxv. 1 sq. The collection of proverbial discourses, i. 7—ix. 18, being intentionally arranged according to a plan, is of course excluded from such a judgment. BENGEL says: "I have often been in such an attitude of soul, that those chapters in the Book of Proverbs in which I had before looked for no connection whatever, presented themselves to me as if the proverbs belonged in the most beautiful order one with another" (OSK. WAECHTER, *Joh. Albrecht Bengel*, p. 166). We must pass the same judgment upon many other expositors of the elder days, who wearied themselves much to find a deeper connection between the several proverbs (see, *e. g.*, S. BOHLIUS, *Ethica Sacra*, I., 297 sq., "*de dispositione et cohærentia textus;*" and STÖCKER in the Introduction to his "*Sermons on the Proverbs of Solomon*"). In regard to this matter as old a commentator as MART. GEIER judged quite correctly:* "*Ordo frustra quæritur ubi nullus fuit observatus. Quamquam enim sub initium forte libri certa serie Rex noster sua proposuerit,—attamen ubi ad ipsas proprie dictas parabolas aut gnomas devenitur, promiscue, prout quidque se offerebat, consignata videmus pleraque, ita ut modo de avaritia, modo de mendaciis, modo de simplicitate, modo de timore Dei vel alia materia sermonem institui videamus,*" *etc.* As in the case of the great majority of the songs of the Psalter, in which the arrangement is merely and altogether external, determined often by single expressions, or by circumstances wholly accidental, there is found among the germinal elements of the Book of Proverbs little or no systematic order. The whole is simply a combination of numerous small elements in a collection, which was to produce its effect more by the total impression than by the mutual relation of its various groups or divisions. To use HERDER's language (*Spirit of Hebrew Poetry*, II., 13), it is "a beautiful piece of tapestry of lofty didactic poetry, which spreads out with great brilliancy its richly embroidered flowers," which, however, is constructed according to no other rules of art than those perfectly simple and elementary ones to which the pearl jewelry and bright tapestries of Oriental proverbial wisdom in general owe their origin. Comp. furthermore the general preliminary remarks prefixed to the exegetical comments on chap. x.

§ 15. THE DOGMATIC AND ETHICAL SUBSTANCE OF THE PROVERBS, EXHIBITED IN A CAREFUL SURVEY OF THE CONTENTS OF THE BOOK.

Inasmuch as our book, considered as an integral part of the entire system of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, stands before us as the central and main source of Solomon's doctrine of wisdom (in the wider sense),—and so bears as it were written on its brow its Divine designation to be the chief storehouse of ethical wisdom and knowledge within the sphere of Old Testament revelation (see above, § 1, and § 10, latter part) we must anticipate finding in it great treasures of ethical teachings, prescriptions, rules and maxims for the practical life of men in their moral relations. In fact, the ethical contents of the collection far outweigh the doctrinal. And deeply significant as may be its contributions to the development of individual subjects in dogmatic theology, such as are found in various passages (*e. g.*, iii. 19 and viii. 22 sq. in their bearing upon the doctrine of

* It is in vain to seek for order where none has been observed. For while perhaps near the beginning of the book our king arranged his material with a definite plan,—yet when we come to the parables or gnomes properly so called we find the greater part recorded at random, as one after another suggested itself, so that we see the discourse turning now upon avarice, then upon falsehoods, again upon simplicity, and once more upon the fear of God, or some other subject," etc.—TR.

Digitized by Google

the creation;—viii. 22—ix. 12 as related to the doctrine of the eternal Word of God, and the doctrine of the Hypostasis or of the Trinity in general;—xv. 11; xvi. 9; xix. 21; xx. 27, *etc.*, as connected with Biblical Anthropology; or xi. 7; xiv. 32; xv. 24 in connection with the Old Testament doctrine of Immortality and the hope of a Resurrection, *etc.*); still, as a general rule, practical and ethical subjects are treated not only more thoroughly but with a far more direct interest. The book deserves much more the name of a school of morals, or of a Codex of Ethical Precepts for old and young, for princes and people, than that of Archives of Dogmatic Theology, or a prolific Repository of dogmatic propositions and proof-texts.

The dogmatic propositions do not, however, by any means stand in the midst of the greater wealth of ethical teachings and precepts, isolated and interspersed without system. They form rather every where the organic basis. They give expression to the absolute and primary premises for all the moral instruction, knowledge and conduct of men. They appear therefore inseparably combined with those propositions that are properly of an ethical or admonitory nature. It is pre-eminently the central idea of the DIVINE WISDOM as the mediator in all the activity of God in the world and in humanity, that shines out bright as the sun upon this background of religious truth which is every where perceptible in the book, and that more or less directly illuminates every moral utterance. As this eternal Divine wisdom is the original source in all God's revelation of Himself in natural and human life,—as it is especially the mediating and executive agency in the Divine revelation of the way of life in the law of the Old Covenant, and must therefore be the highest source of knowledge and the standard for all the religious and moral life of man,—so likewise does it appear as the highest good, and as the prescribed goal toward which men are to press. And the subjective wisdom of man is nothing but the finite likeness of the wisdom of God, which is not only objective, but absolute and infinite; nothing but the full unfolding and normal development of the noblest theoretical and practical powers of the moral nature of man. It can be attained only by the devotion of man to its Divine original; it is therefore essentially dependent upon the fear of God and willing subjection to the salutary discipline (מוּסָר, i. 2, 8; iv. 1, *etc.*) of the Divine word. He who does not seek it in this way does not attain it, but remains a fool, an opposer of God and of Divine truth, who in the same ratio as he fails to raise his own moral nature by normal development to a living likeness to God, fails also to share in any true prosperity in the present life, to say nothing of the blessed rewards of the future. He who because of the fear of God strives after true wisdom, on the contrary unfolds his whole inner and outer life to such a symmetry of all his powers and activities as not only secures him the praise of a wise man in the esteem of God and men, but also establishes his true and complete happiness for time and eternity.

A presentation of these fundamental ideas in the ethics of Solomon, well connected, systematically arranged and exhibited, cannot possibly be expected consistently with the note appended to the preceding section in reference to the composition of the Book of Proverbs. If we therefore now endeavor to give a table of contents as complete as possible, following the arrangement of the Masoretic text and the ordinary division of chapters, we shall be quite as unable to avoid a frequent transition to heterogeneous subjects, as on the other hand a return in many instances to something already presented; we must in many cases dispense with even aiming at a strict logical order of ideas. We follow in the main the "Summary of the Contents of the Proverbs of Solomon," given by STARKE at the end of his preface, pp. 1593 sq. Only with respect to the first nine chapters do we adopt the somewhat different summary and division which DELITZSCH has given (pp. 697 sq.) of the "fifteen proverbial discourses" of the first main division.

Digitized by Google

GENERAL SUPERSCRIPTION OF THE COLLECTION.

CHAP. I. 1—6.

Announcement of the author of the collection (ver. 1) of its object (vers. 2, 3), and of its great value (vers. 4-6).

I. Introductory Division.

CHAP. I. 7—IX. 18.

True wisdom as the basis and end of all moral effort, impressed by admonition and commendation upon the hearts of youth.

MOTTO: "*The fear of the Lord is the beginning of all knowledge;*" i. 7.

1. Group of admonitory discourses; i. 8—iii. 35.
   1. Admonition of the teacher of wisdom to his son to avoid the way of vice; I. 8-19.
   2. Warning delineation of the perverse and ruinous conduct of the fool, put into the mouth of Wisdom (personified); I. 20-33.
   3. Exhibition of the blessed consequences of obedience and of striving after wisdom; II. 1-22.
   4. Continuation of the exhibition of the salutary results of this devout and pious life; III. 1-18.
   5. Description of the powerful protection which God, the wise Creator of the world, grants to those that fear Him; III. 19-26.
   6. Admonition to charity and justice; III. 27-35.

2. Group of admonitory discourses; IV. 1—VII. 27.
   7. Report of the teacher of wisdom concerning the good counsels in favor of piety, and the warnings against vice, which were addressed to him in his youth by his father; IV. 1-27.
   8. Warning against intercourse with lewd women, and against the ruinous consequences of licentiousness; V. 1-23.
   9. Warning against inconsiderate suretyship; VI. 1-5.
   10. Rebuke of the sluggard; VI. 6-11.
   11. Warning against malice and wanton violence; VI. 12-19.
   12. Admonition to chastity, with a warning delineation of the fearful consequences of adultery; VI. 20-35.
   13. New admonition to chastity, with a reference to the repulsive example of a youth led astray by a harlot; VII. 1-27.

3. Group of admonitory discourses; VIII. 1—IX. 18.
   14. A second public discourse of Wisdom (personified) chap. VIII., having reference
       a) to the richness of her gifts (vers. 1-21);
       b) to the origin of her nature in God (vers. 21-31); and
       c) to the blessing that flows from the possession of her (vers. 32-36).
   15. Allegorical exhibition of the call of men to the possession and enjoyment of true wisdom, under the figure of an invitation to two banquets (chap. IX.),
       a) that of Wisdom; vers. 1-12.
       b) that of Folly; vers. 13-18.

II. Original nucleus of the collection,—genuine proverbs of Solomon; X. 1—XXII. 16.

Ethical maxims, precepts, and admonitions, with respect to the most diverse relations of human life.

Digitized by Google

1. Exhibition of the difference between the pious and the ungodly, and their respective lots in life; chap. X.—XV.*

a) Comparison between the pions and the ungodly with reference to their life and conduct in general; X. 1-32.

b) Comparison between the good results of piety, and the disadvantages and penalties of ungodliness (chap. XI.—XV.), and particularly

α) with reference to just and unjust, benevolent and malevolent conduct toward one's neighbor; chap. XI.;

β) with reference to domestic, civil and public avocations; chap. XII;

γ) with reference to the use of temporal good, and of the word of God as the highest good: chap. XIII.;

δ) with reference to the relation between the wise and the foolish, the rich and the poor, masters and servants: chap. XIV.;

ε) with reference to various other relations and callings in life, especially within the sphere of religion: chap. XV.;

2. Exhortations to a life in the fear of God, and in obedience; (chap. XVI. 1—XXII. 16); and in particular

α) to confidence in God as the wise regulator and ruler of the world; chap. XVI.;

β) to contentment and a peaceable disposition; chap. XVII.;

γ) to affability, fidelity, and the other virtues of social life; ch. XVIII.;

δ) to humility, meekness and gentleness; chap. XIX.;

ε) to the avoidance of drunkenness, indolence, quarrelsomeness, *etc.*; chap. XX.;

ζ) to justice, patience, and dutiful submission to God's gracious control; chap. XXI.;

η) to the obtaining and preserving of a good name; chap. XXII. 1-16.

III. Additions made before Hezekiah's day to the genuine proverbs of Solomon which form the nucleus of the collection; chap. XXII. 17—XXIV. 34.

1st Addition: Various injunctions of justice and prudence in life; XXII. 17—XXIV. 22.

a) Introductory admonition to lay to heart the words of the wise; XXII. 17-21;

b) Admonition to justice toward others, especially the poor; XXII. 22-29;

c) Warning against avarice, intemperance, licentiousness and other such vices: chap. XXIII.;

d) Warning against companionship with the wicked and foolish; chap. XXIV. 1-22.

2d Addition: chap. XXIV. 23-34.

a) Various admonitions to right conduct toward one's neighbor; vers. 23-29.

b) Warning against indolence and its evil consequences: vers. 30-34.

IV. Gleanings by the men of Hezekiah; chap. XXV.—XXIX.

True wisdom proclaimed as the highest good to Kings and their subjects.

Superscription; XXV. 1.

1. Admonition to the fear of God and to righteousness, addressed to Kings and subjects; chap. XXV.

* The justification for comprehending the contents of these chapters under the above heading is to be found in this,—that the so called antithetic Maschal form is decidedly predominant in them. Comp. above § 14, p. 82, and also the general prefatory remarks which introduce the exegetical comments on chap. x.

Digitized by Google

2. Various warnings: *viz.*

a) Against disgraceful conduct (especially folly, indolence, and malice) chap. XXVI.

b) Against vain self-praise and arrogance; chap. XXVII. (with an exhortation to prudence and frugality in husbandry; vers. 23-27).

c) Against unscrupulous, unlawful dealing, especially of the rich with the poor; chap. XXVIII.

d) Against stubbornness and insubordination; chap. XXIX.

V. The Supplements: chaps. XXX., XXXI.

1st Supplement: the words of Agur; chap. XXX.

a) Introduction: Of the word of God as the source of all wisdom; vers. 1-6.

b) Various pithy numerical apothegms, having reference to the golden mean between rich and poor, to profligacy, insatiable greed, pride, arrogance, *etc.;* vers. 7–33.

2d Supplement: The words of Lemuel, together with the poem in praise of the matron: chap. XXXI.

a) Lemuel's philosophy for kings; vers. 1-9.

b) Alphabetic poem in praise of the virtuous, wise, and industrious woman; vers. 10-31.

NOTE. The more thorough presentation of the didactic substance of the proverbs is reserved for the exposition that is to follow, and especially for the rubric "Doctrinal and Practical." As the best connected discussion of this subject (biblical and theological) we should be able without hesitation to commend that of BRUCH (*Weisheitslehre der Hebräer*, pp. 110 sq.), if it were not characterized by the fault which pervades BRUCH's treatise, so meritorious in other respects,—that in the interest of critical and humanitarian views it misrepresents the stand-point and the tendency of the Hhokmah-doctrine. That is to say, it insists that there is in this attitude of mind a relation of indifference or even of hostility toward the theocratic cultus and the ceremonial law, like the relation of the philosophers and free-thinkers of Christendom to the orthodox creed. No less clearly does he insist upon the general limitation to the present life of every assumption of a moral retribution; and in his view there is an entire absence of the hope of immortality from the view of the world taken in our book. For the refutation of these misconceptions of BRUCH (which are undeniably in conflict with such passages as, on the one side, xiv. 9; xxviii. 4 sq.; xxix. 18, 24; xxx. 17; and on the other xii. 28; xiv. 32; xv. 24; xxiii. 18, *etc.*), OEHLER's able treatise may be referred to: "*Grundzüge der alttestamentl. Weisheit*" (Tüb. 1854, 4); although this deals more especially with the doctrinal teachings of the Book of Job, than with Proverbs. See likewise EWALD (as above quoted, pp. 8 sq.; ELSTER, § 1, pp. 1-6; DELITZSCH, pp. 714-716, and even HITZIG, pp. xii. sq.)

§ 16. THEOLOGICAL AND HOMILETICAL LITERATURE ON THE BOOK OF PROVERBS.

Beside the general commentaries (of which we shall have especial occasion to make use of STARKE's *Synopsis*, the *Berleburg Bible*, J. LANGE's *Licht und Recht*, WOHLFARTH and FISCHER's *Prediger-Bibel*, the *Calwer Handbuch*, and VON GERLACH's Commentary) we must mention the following as the most important exegetical helps to the study of the Proverbs. MELANCHTHON: *Explicatio Proverbiorum*, 1525 (*Opp.*, T. XIV.); SEBAST. MUNSTER, *Prov. Salom. juxta hebr. verit. translata et annotationibus illustrata* (without date); J. MERCERUS, *Comm. in Salomonis Proverbia, Eccl. et Cantic.*, 1573; MALDONATUS, *Comm. in præcipuos libros V. Testamenti*, 1643; F. Q. SALAZAR, *In Prov. Sal. Commentarius*, 1636-7; MART. GEIER, *Prov. Salomonis cum cura enucleata*, 1653, 1725; THOM. CARTWRIGHT, *Commentarii succincti et dilucidi in Prov. Sal.*, 1663; CHR. BEN. MICHAELIS, *Annotationes in Prov.* (in J. H. MICHAELIS, "*Uberiores annotationes in Hagiogr. V. Test. libros*," 1720, Vol. 1); A. SCHULTENS, *Prov. Salom. vers. integram ad Hebr. fontem expressit atque comm. adjecit*, 1748; (*In compend. redegit et*

Digitized by Google

obss. critt. auxit G. J. L. VOGEL, Hal., 1768-9); J. D. MICHAELIS, *Die Sprüche Sal. und der Prediger übs. mit Anmerkungen, für Ungelehrte*, 1778; J. CHR. DÖDERLEIN, *Die Sprüche Salomonis mit Anmerkungen*, 1778, 3d edn. 1786; W. C. ZIEGLER, *Neue Uebers. der Denksprüche Salomonis*, 1791; H. MUNTINGHE, *Uebers. der Spr., a. d. Holländ. von* SCHOLL, 1800-2; CHR. G. HENSLER, *Erläuterungen des* 1 *Buches Samuels und der Salom. Denksprüche*, 1796; J. FR. SCHELLING, *Salomonis quæ supersunt omnia lat. vertit notasque adjecit*, 1806; J. G. DAHLER, *Denk- und Sittensprüche Salomos, nebst den Abweichungen der Alex. Vers. ins Deutsche übers. mit Vorrede von* BLESSIG, 1810; C. P. W. GRAMBERG, *Das Buch der Sprüche Sal., neu übersetzt, systemat. geordnet, mit erkl. Anm. u. Parall.*, 1828; F. W. C. UMBREIT, *Philol.-Krit. und Philos. Comm. über die Sprüche Sal., nebst einer neuen Uebers. Einl. in die morgenl. Weisheit überhaupt u. in d. Salomonische insbes.*, 1826; H. EWALD, *die poetischen Bücher des A. Bundes*, Th. IV., 1837; F. MAURER, *Comm. gram. crit. in Prov., in usum academiarum adornatus*, 1841; C. BRIDGES, An exposition of the Book of Proverbs, 2 Vols., Lond., 1847 [1 Vol., New York, 1847]; E. BERTHEAU, *Die Sprüche Sal.* in the "*Kurzgef. exeg. Handb. z. A. T.*," 1847; VAIHINGER, *Die Spr. Sal.*, 1857; F. HITZIG, *Die Spr. Sal. übers. u. ausgelegt*, 1858; E. ELSTER, *Comm. über d. Salomonischen Sprüche*, 1858. [ADOLF KAMPHAUSEN, in BUNSEN'S *Bibelwerk*, 1865].

[Besides the standard general Commentaries of HENRY, PATRICK, ADAM CLARKE, GILL, ORTON, SCOTT, TRAPP and others, a considerable number of special commentaries on Proverbs have been written by English and American scholars. Among these are BEDE, *Expositio allegorica in Salom. Proverbia;* M. COPE, Exposition upon Proverbs, translated by M. OUTRED, London, 1580; P. A. MUFFET, a Commentary on the Proverbs of Solomon, 2d ed. London, 1598; republished in NICHOL'S Series of Commentaries, Edinburgh, 1868; T. WILCOCKS a short yet sound Commentary on the Proverbs of Solomon (in his works); JOHN DOD, a plain and familiar exposition of Proverbs (chap. ix. to xvii.), 1608–9; JERMIN, Paraphrastical Meditations by way of Commentary on the whole Book of Proverbs, London, 1638; F. TAYLOR (Exposition with practical reflections on chaps. i.—ix.), London, 1655–7; Sir EDWARD LEIGH, in his "Annotations on the Five Poetical Books of the Old Testament," London, 1657; H. HAMMOND, Paraphrase and Annotations, *etc.;* RICHARD GREY, The Book of Proverbs divided according to metre, *etc.*, London, 1738; D. DURELL, in his "Critical Remarks on Job, Proverbs, *etc.*, Oxford, 1772; T. HUNT, Observations on several passages, *etc.*, Oxford, 1775; B. HODGSON, The Proverbs of Solomon translated from the Hebrew, Oxford, 1788; G. HOLDEN, An Attempt towards an Improved Translation, *etc.*, Liverpool, 1819; G. LAWSON, Exposition of the Book of Proverbs, Edinb., 1821; R J. CASE, Comm. on the Proverbs of Solomon, London, 1822; FRENCH and SKINNER, a new translation, *etc.*, Camb., 1831; W. NEWMAN, The Proverbs of Solomon, an improved version, London, 1839; B. E. NICHOLLS, The Proverbs of Solomon explained and illustrated, London, 1842; G. R. NOYES, in his "New Translation of the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and the Canticles" *etc.*, Boston, 1846; M. STUART, Commentary on the Book of Proverbs, Andover, 1852; J. MUENSCHER, The Book of Proverbs in an amended Version, *etc.*, Gambier, 1866; CHR. WORDSWORTH, Vol. IV., Part III. of his Commentary on the Bible, London, 1868.]

Jewish Rabbinic Expositions; ANT. GIGGEJUS, *In Proverbia Salomonis commentarii trium Rabbinorum; Sal. Isacidis, Abr. Aben Ezræ, Levi ben Ghersom, quos A. Gigg. interpret. est, castig., illustr.*, Mediolan, 1620. Of the more recent Rabbinical commentaries, that in Hebrew by LÖWENSTEIN, Frkft. a. M., 1838, is of special importance, and also that by L. DUKES, in COHEN'S Commentary (Paris, 1847; *Proverbes*), where the earlier expositions of learned Jews upon our book, 38 in all, from SAADIA to LÖWENSTEIN, are enumerated and estimated.

Literature in Monographs. 1. Critical and exegetical: J. F. HOFFMANN and J. TH. SPRENGER, *Observationes ad quædam loca Proverbb. Sal.*, Tubing. 1776; * J. J. REISKE, *Conjecturæ in Jobum et Provv. Salom.*, Lips. 1779; A. S. ARNOLDI, *Zur Exegetik und Kritik des A. Tests*, 1. *Beitrag*; *Anmerkungen über einzelne Stellen d. Spr. Sal.*, 1781; J. J. BELLERMANN, *Ænigmata hebraica*, Prov. xxx. 11 sq., 15 sq., *explicata*, spec. 1-3, Erford. 1798-9; H. F.

* In UMBREIT (p. lxvi.) and in KEIL (p. 395) CHR. FR. SCHNURRER is incorrectly named as the author of this little treatise. It was rather a dissertation defended by the scholars above named under SCHNURRER'S rectorate.

Digitized by Google

MUEHLAU, *De proverbiorum quæ dicuntur Aguri et Lemuelis* (Prov. xxx. 1—xxxi. 9) *origine atque indole*, *Leips.*, 1869.—Compare moreover the works already named in § 13, note 1, among which especial prominence should be given to FR. BÖTTCHER's "*Neue exegetisch-kritische Aehrenlese z. A. Test.* (Abth. III., *herausg. von.* F. MUEHLAU, Lips. 1865), as likewise to the treatises which are there mentioned by P. DE LAGARDE and M. HEIDENHEIM (the former judging somewhat too unfavorably of the LXX, the latter in some cases contesting the exaggerations of the former, and in other instances reducing them to their proper measure); for these are important aids to the criticism and exegesis of single passages.

2. Practical and Homiletical: SAM. BOHLIUS, *Ethica sacra*, Rost. 1640 (compare note to § 1); J. STÖCKER (Pastor at Eisleben, died in 1649) Sermons on the Proverbs of Solomon; OETINGER, *Die Wahrheit des* sensus communis *in den Sprüchen und dem Prediger Salomonis*, Stuttg., 1753; STAUDENMAIER, *Die Lehre von der Idee* (1840), pp. 37 sq. (valuable observations on Prov. viii. 22 sq.); C. I. NITZSCH, on the essential Trinity of God, *Theod. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1841, II., 295 (on the same passage; see especially pp. 310 sq.); R. STIER, *Der Weise ein König*, Solomon's Proverbs according to the compilation of the men of Hezekiah (chap. xxv.—xxix.), expounded for the School and the Life of all times, Barmen, 1849 (the same work also elaborated for the laity, under the title "Solomon's wisdom in Hezekiah's days"); same author: "The Politics of Wisdom in the words of Agur and Lemuel," Prov. xxx. and xxxi. Timely scriptural exposition for every man, with an appendix for scholars, Barmen, 1850. [In English no other recent work of this sort can be compared with ARNOT's "Laws from Heaven for Life on Earth," 2d edn. Lond., 1866. Bishop HALL's "Characters of Virtues and Vices," London, 1609, is designed to be an epitome of the Ethics of Soiomon. R. WARDLAW: Lectures on the Book of Proverbs (a posthumous publication), 3 Vols., London, 1861].

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

THE

PROVERBS OF SOLOMON.

General Superscription to the Collection.

Announcement of the Author of the Collection, of its Object, and of its great value.

CHAP. I. 1-6.

1 Proverbs of Solomon, the son of David,
the King of Israel:
2 to become acquainted with wisdom and knowledge,
to comprehend intelligent discourse,
3 to attain discipline of understanding,
righteousness, justice and integrity,
4 to impart to the simple prudence,
to the young man knowledge and discretion;—
5 let the wise man hear and add to his learning,
and the man of understanding gain in control,
6 that he may understand proverb and enigma,
words of wise men and their dark sayings.

INTRODUCTORY SECTION.

True wisdom as the basis and end of all moral effort, impressed by admonition and commendation upon the hearts of youth.

CHAP. I. 7—IX. 18.

7 The fear of Jehovah is the beginning of knowledge;
wisdom and discipline fools despise.

First group of Admonitory or Gnomic Discourses.

CHAP. I. 8—III. 35.

1. The teacher of wisdom admonishes his son to avoid the way of vice.

CHAP. I. 8-19.

8 Hearken, my son, to thy father's instruction,
and refuse not the teaching of thy mother;
9 for they are a graceful crown to thy head,
and jewels about thy neck.—
10 My son, if sinners entice thee,
consent thou not!

Digitized by Google

11 If they say, "Come with us, and we will lie in wait for blood,
will plot against the innocent without cause;
12 we will swallow them, like the pit, living,
and the upright, like those that descend into the grave;
13 we will find all precious treasure,
will fill our houses with spoil!
14 Thou shalt cast in thy lot among us;
one purse will we all have!"
15 My son! go not in the way with them,
keep back thy foot from their path!
16 For their feet run to evil,
and haste to shed blood;
17 for in vain is the net spread
before the eyes of all (kinds of) birds:
18 and these watch for their own blood,
they lie in wait for their own lives.
19 Such are the paths of every one that grasps after unjust gain;
from its own master it taketh the life.

Chap. I. 20-33.

2. Warning delineation of the perverse and ruinous conduct of the fool, put into the mouth of wisdom (personified).

20 Wisdom crieth aloud in the streets,
on the highways she maketh her voice heard:
21 in the places of greatest tumult she calleth,
at the entrances to the gates of the city she giveth forth her words:
22 "How long, ye simple, will ye love simplicity,
and scorners delight in scorning,
and fools hate knowledge!
23 Turn ye at my reproof!
Behold I will pour out upon you my spirit,
my words will I make known to you!
24 Because I have called and ye refused,
I stretched out my hand, and no man regarded it,
25 and ye have rejected all my counsel,
and to my reproof ye have not yielded;
26 therefore will I also laugh at your calamity,
will mock when your terror cometh;
27 when like a storm your terror cometh,
and your destruction sweepeth on like a whirlwind,
when distress and anguish cometh upon you.
28 Then will they call upon me, and I not answer,
they will seek me diligently and not find me.
29 Because they have hated sound wisdom
and have not desired the fear of Jehovah,
30 have not yielded to my counsel
and have despised all my reproof,
31 therefore shall they eat of the fruit of their way
and be surfeited with their own counsels.
32 For the perverseness of the simple shall slay them,
and the security of fools destroy them:
33 he, however, who hearkeneth to me shall dwell secure,
and have rest without dread of evil!"

Digitized by Google

GRAMMATICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 2. [We have in vers. 2, 3, 4, 6 final clauses, introduced by לְ, and indicating the object with which these wise sayings are recorded. That purpose is disciplinary, first with reference to "the young man," and then to him who is already "wise." This discipline is contemplated not from the point of view of him who imparts, but that of those who receive it. These considerations determine our choice of words in translating several of the terms employed. Thus in ver. 2 we render לָדַעַת not "to know," as this suggests the finished result rather than the process, which is "to become acquainted with, to acquire;" so ZÖCKLER, *zu erkennen*; DE WETTE, *kennen zu lernen*; NOYES, "*from which men may learn*;" a little less definitely, E. V., "to know;" incorrectly HOLDEN, "respecting the knowledge." These wise sayings are to guide to and result in knowledge; but the verbs, except in ver. 4, represent not the teaching, imparting, communicating, but the discerning and seizing. In respect to the two shades of meaning to be given to מוּסָר see the exeg. notes. GESEN. and FUERST agree in the etymology (יסר); FUERST, however, carries back the radical meaning one step farther; G., "to chastise, correct, instruct;" F., "to bind or restrain, chastise," *etc.* It should, therefore, be borne in mind that more than the imparting of information is intended by the word, it is *discipline*, sometimes merely intellectual but more frequently moral.—אִמְרֵי בִינָה, lit., "words of discernment," "words of understanding" (so E. V., NOYES, MUENSCHER); STUART, "words of the intelligent;" DE WETTE like ZÖCKLER, "*verständige Reden*;" VAN ESS and ALLIOLI, with whom HOLDEN seems to agree, "*die Worte* (*Regeln*) *der Klugheit*," "the words (rules) of prudence."—A.].

Ver. 3. מוּסַר הַשְׂכֵּל,—our author's conception (see exeg. notes) corresponds with that of FUERST also, who makes the genitive not merely objective, as DE WETTE, *etc.*, seem to do ("discipline of understanding," "*die Zucht der Vernunft*"), but makes it final, contemplating the end: FUERST, "*Z. zur Besonnenheit*," ZÖCKLER, "*einsichtsvolle Zucht*," discipline full of discernment, insight, understanding, *i. e.*, in its results. The rendering of most of our English expositors is ambiguous or suggests other ideas: E V. and MUENSCHER, "*instruction of wisdom*;" HOLDEN, "*instruction in wisdom*;" NOYES, "*the instruction of prudence*;" STUART, "*of discreetness*."—מֵישָׁרִים, plural of that which is "ideally extended" and pleasurable; BÖTTCHER, *Ausf. Lehrb.*, § 699.—A.].

Ver. 5. [E. V., followed by HOLDEN and MUENSCHER, "*a wise man will hear*;" NOYES, "*may hear*;" STUART, more forcibly, "let the wise man listen," like our author, "*es höre*," and BÖTTCHER (§ 950. *d.*, "*Fiens debitum*") "*es soll hören*." DE WETTE makes this a final clause, like those of the three preceding verses. "*dass der Weise höre*;" but see exeg. notes. וְיוֹסֵף is given by BÖTTCHER (§ 964, 2) as an illustration of the "consultive" use of the Jussive; STUART makes it an ordinary Imperf., and renders "and he will add;" but his explanations are not pertinent; the וְ need not be "conversive," it is simply copulative, and יוֹסֵף which he assumes as the normal Imperf., is already a Jussive.—A.]. לֶקַח, properly that which is "taken, received, transmitted" (comp. the verb לָקַח, "to attain," above in ver. 3) is like the Aram. קַבָּלָה (from קַבֵּל, to take), and like the Latin *traditio* [in its passive sense]. The parallel term תַּחְבֻּלוֹת (from חָבַל, to lead, according to the analogy of the Arabic, and cognate with חֶבֶל, cable, and חֹבֵל, steersman) is by the LXX correctly rendered by κυβέρνησις.

Ver. 6. LUTHER's translation of the 1st clause, "that he may understand proverbs and their interpretation," cannot possibly be right; for מְלִיצָה, if it was designed to convey any other idea than one parallel to מָשָׁל could not on any principle dispense with the suffix of the 3d person (־הָ), its, comp. Vulgate: "*animadvertat parabolam et interpretationem*." [This is also the rendering of the E. V., which is followed by HOLDEN, while NOYES, STUART, MUENSCHER and WORDSWORTH, DE WETTE and VAN ESS agree with the view taken by our author.—A.].

Ver. 7. אֱוִילִים, derived from אוּל, *crassus fuit*; to be gross or dull of understanding;—GESEN., however, derives it from the radical idea "to be perverse, turned away," and FUERST "to be slack, weak, lax or lazy." [WORDSWORTH adopts the latter explanation—A.].

Ver. 8. [The different renderings given to the verb of the 2d clause while agreeing in their substantial import, "forsake," "neglect," "reject," do not reproduce with equal clearness the radical idea, which is that of "spreading," then of "scattering."—A].

Ver. 10. תֹּבֵא, *scriptio defectiva*, for תֹּאבֶא, as some 50 MSS. cited by KENNICOTT and DE ROSSI in fact read, while some others prefer a different pointing אַל־תָּבֹא [thou shalt not go], which is however an unwarranted emendation. The LXX had the correct conception: μὴ βουληθῇς, and the Vulgate: *ne acquiescas*.—[Comp. GREEN's *Heb. Gram.*, § 111, 2, b, and § 177, 3. BÖTTCHER discusses the form several times in different connections, §§ 325, *d*, and n. 2,—429, B, and 1164, 2, *b*,—and after enumerating the six forms which the MSS. supply, תָּבוֹא, תָּבֹא, תֹּאבֶה, תֹּאבֶא, תֹּאבֶה, and תּוֹבֵא decides that the original form, whose obscurity suggested all these modifications, was תֹּאבֶא = תֹּבֵא. In signification he classes it with the "dehortative" Jussives.—A.].

Ver. 11. [E. V., NOYES, WORDSWORTH, LUTHER, VAN ESS agree with one another in connecting the adverb with the verb, while DE WETTE, HOLDEN, STUART, MUENSCHER regard it as modifying the adjective, "him whose innocence is of no avail to protect him."—A.].

Ver. 12. [E. V., STUART and MUENSCHER, like our author connect חַיִּים with the object of the main verb; UMBREIT and HITZIG (see exeg. notes) are followed by DE WETTE, HOLDEN, NOYES in connecting it with the comparative clause.—יוֹרְדֵי בוֹר, for construction see *e. g.*, GREEN, §§ 271, 2 and 254, 9, b.—A.].

Ver. 16. [יָרוּצוּ, masc. verb with feminine subject; BÖTT., § 936, II., *C. a*; GREEN, § 275, 1. *c*.—A.].

Ver. 20. The Wisdom who is here speaking is in this verse called חָכְמוֹת, which is not a plural but "a new abstract derivative from חָכְמָה, formed with the ending וֹת" (EWALD, § 165, c) a form which is also found *e. g.*, in תְּהֹמוֹת, Ps. lxxviii. 15. The name recurs in the same form in ix. 1; xxiv. 7. [BÖTTCHER, however, regards this as an example of the *pluralis extens.*, to denote emphatically "true wisdom." See § 679, *d*, 689, *C.*, *b*, 700, *c* and n. 4. There is no difficulty in connecting a verb fem. sing. with a subject which although plural in form is singular in idea.—A.].—תָּרֹנָּה, crieth aloud, from רָנַן, comp. Lam. ii. 19; 3d sing. fem. as also in viii. 3 (EWALD, 191, c). [Comp. GREEN, § 97, 1, a, and BÖTT., § 929, *d*, who with his usual minuteness endeavors to trace the development of this idiom.—A.].

Ver. 21. ZÖCKLER, *an den lärmvollsten Orten*; DE WETTE, *an der Ecke lärmender Strassen*; FUERST, *der bewegten Strassen*; HOLDEN, like the Eng. Ver., *in the chief place of concourse*.

Digitized by Google

Ver. 22. [For the vocalization of תֶּאֱהָבוּ see GREEN, §§ 60, 3, c., 111, 2, e. For the use of the perfect חָמְדוּ see BÖTT., § 948, 2. He illustrates by such classical perfects as ἔγνωκα, οἶδα, μέμαα, *memini*, *novi*, and renders this form by *concupiverint*.—A.].

Ver. 23. [אַבִּיעָה, an instance of the intentional Imperf., in what BÖTTCHER calls its "voluntative" signification,—§ 965, 1.—A.].

Ver. 27. [כְּשַׁאֲוָה, K'ri כְּשׁוֹאָה, the former derived from שָׁאו or שָׁאָה, the latter from שׁוֹא, of which verbs the latter is obsolete except in derivatives, while the former occurs in one passage in Is. in the Niphal. The signification seems to be one and the forms variations growing out of the weakness of the 2d and 3d radicals. Comp. BÖTT., §§ 474, *a*, and 811, 2.—A.].

Instead of the Infin. בְּבֹא, we have in the 2d member, since בְּ is not repeated, the Imperf. יֶאֱתֶה (EWALD, 337, b) [STUART, § 129, 3, n. 2].—A.

Ver. 28. [יִמְצָאֻנְנִי, יְשַׁחֲרֻנְנִי, יִקְרָאֻנְנִי. These are among the few instances in which the full plural ending וּן is found before suffixes. GREEN, § 105, c., BÖTT., § 1047, *f*.—A.].

Ver. 29. For the use of תַּחַת כִּי, "therefore because," compare Deut. xxxiv. 7, and also the equivalent combination תַּחַת אֲשֶׁר in 2 Kings xxii. 7; 2 Chron. xxi. 12.

EXEGETICAL.

1. Vers. 1–6. The superscription to the collection, which is quite long, as is common with the titles of Oriental books, is not designed to be a "table of contents" (UMBREIT), nor to give merely the aim of the book (so most commentators, especially EWALD, BERTHEAU, ELSTER, *etc.*). But beside the author of the book (ver. 1), it is intended to give first its design (vers. 2, 3), and then, in addition, its worth and use (vers. 4–6), and so to commend the work in advance as salutary and excellent (STARKE, DELITZSCH). Accordingly it praises the book as a source of wholesome and instructive wisdom: 1) for the simple-minded and immature (ver. 4); 2) for those who are already wise and intelligent, but who are to gain still more insight and understanding from its maxims and enigmas (vers. 5, 6).—**Proverbs of Solomon**, *etc.*—In regard to the primary meaning of מָשָׁל, and in regard to the special signification which prevails here in the superscription, "Proverbs of Solomon" (maxims, aphorisms, not proverbs [in the current and popular sense]), see Introd., § 11.—**To become acquainted with wisdom and knowledge.**—In respect to חָכְמָה and its synonyms (בִּינָה and דַּעַת) consult again the Introd., § 2, note 3. מוּסָר properly "chastisement," signifies education, moral training, good culture and habits, the practical side, as it were, of wisdom (LXX: παιδεία; Vulg.: *disciplina*). In ver. 2 the expression stands as synonymous with "wisdom" (חָכְמָה), as in iv. 13; xxiii. 23, and frequently elsewhere; in ver. 3, on the contrary, it designates an element preparatory to true wisdom and insight,—one serving as their foundation, and a preliminary condition to them. For the "discipline of understanding" (מוּסַר הַשְׂכֵּל, ver. 3) is not, as might be conceived, "discipline under which the understanding is placed," but "discipline, training to reason, to a reasonable, intelligent condition" (as HITZIG rightly conceives it); compare the "discipline of wisdom" (מוּסַר חָכְמָה), xv. 33, and for "understanding" (הַשְׂכֵּל), insight, discernment, a rational condition, see particularly xxi. 16. UMBREIT and EWALD regard הַשְׂכֵּל as equivalent to thoughtfulness ("a discipline to thoughtfulness," *Zuchtigung zur Besonnenheit*"); by this rendering, however, the full meaning of the conception is not exhausted.—**Righteousness, justice and integrity.** The three Hebrew terms צֶדֶק, מִשְׁפָּט and מֵישָׁרִים are related to each other as "righteousness, justice, and integrity, or uprightness" (*Gerechtigkeit, Recht und Geradheit*). The first of the three expressions describes what is fitting according to the will and ordinance of God the supreme Judge (comp. Deut. xxxiii. 19); the second, what is usage and custom among men (Is. xlii. 1; 1 Sam. xxvii. 11): the third, what is right and reasonable, and in accordance with a walking in the way of truth, and so denotes a straight-forward, honorable and upright demeanor.

Ver. 4. **To impart to the simple prudence.**—The telic infinitive (לָתֵת) is co-ordinate with the two that precede in vers. 2 and 3, and has the same subject. Therefore the same construction is to be employed here also (to become acquainted with—to attain—to impart); and we are not, by the introduction of a final clause, to make the contents of this 4th verse subordinate to the preceding, as the LXX do (ἵνα δῷ κ. τ. λ.), and likewise the Vulg. (*ut detur*, *etc.*), and LUTHER ("that the simple may become shrewd, and young men reasonable and considerate"). The "simple" (פְּתָאיִם), properly, the "open," those who are readily accessible to all external impressions, and therefore inexperienced and simple, νήπιοι, ἄκακοι (as the LXX appropriately render the word in this passage; comp. Rom. xvi. 18). With respect to the relation of this idea to that of the "fool" (כְּסִיל, נָבָל) compare what will be said below on i. 32, and also Introd., § 3, note 2.—**Prudence** (עָרְמָה, derived from עָרַם) signifies properly nakedness, smoothness (comp. the adj. עָרוּם ["subtle," E.V.], naked, *i. e.*, slippery, crafty; used of the serpent, Gen. iii. 1); therefore metaphorically "the capacity for escaping from the wiles of others" (UMBREIT), "the prudence which guards itself against injury" (xxii. 3; 1 Sam. xxiii. 22).—**To the young man knowledge and discretion.**—Discretion, thoughtfulness (מְזִמָּה, LXX, ἔννοια), denotes here in connection with "knowledge" (דַּעַת) the characteristic of thoughtful, well considered action, resting upon a thorough know-

Digitized by Google

ledge of things,—therefore, circumspection, caution.

Ver. 5. Not the simple and immature only, but also the wise and intelligent, are to derive instruction from Solomon's proverbs. This idea is not, as might be supposed, thrust in the form of a parenthesis into the series of final clauses beginning with ver. 2, and reaching its conclusion in ver. 6, so that the verb (יִשְׁמַע) is to be conceived of as rendering the clause conditional, and is to be translated "if he hears" (UMBREIT, ELSTER); it begins a new independent proposition, whose imperfect tenses are to be regarded as voluntative, and upon which the new infinitive clause with לְ in ver. 6 is dependent (EWALD, BERTHEAU, and commentators generally).—**Let the wise man hearken and add to his learning.**—As to the expression "add to his learning" (יֹסֶף לֶקַח) comp. ix. 9; xvi. 12. The peculiar term rendered "learning" (see critical notes above) is a designation of knowledge, doctrine, instructive teaching in general; comp. vers. 22 and 29. The word rendered "control," or mastery, is an abstract derivative, strengthened by the ending וֹת (EWALD, *Gramm.*, § 179 a., note 3), and expresses here in an appropriate and telling figure the idea of "skill and facility in the management of life." Comp. xi. 14; xii. 5; Job xxxvii. 12, *etc.* Its relation to "learning" (לֶקַח) is quite like that of "discipline" to "wisdom" in ver. 2; it supplies the practical correlative to the other idea which is predominantly theoretical.

Ver. 6. **To understand proverb and enigma**, *etc.*—["The climax of the definition of wisdom"—STANLEY]. The infinitive (לְהָבִין) supplies the announcement of the end required by ver. 5: to this end is the wise man to gain in knowledge and self-command or self-discipline, that he may understand the proverbs and profound sayings of the wise, *i. e.*, may know how to deal appropriately with them. It is not the mere understanding of the wisdom of proverbs by itself that is here indicated as the end of the wise man's "increase in knowledge and mastery," but practice and expertness in using this wisdom; it is the *callere sententias sapientum* which imparts a competence to communicate further instruction to the youth who need discipline. If the telic infinitive (לְהָבִין) be taken in this frequent sense, for which may be compared among other passages Prov. viii. 9; xvii. 10, 24; Dan. i. 27, we do not need with BERTHEAU to give the expression a participial force (by virtue of the fact that he understands,—understanding proverbs, *etc.*),—nor to maintain with HITZIG and others that ver. 6 is not grammatically connected with ver. 5, on the ground that it is not conceivable that the "learning to understand the words of wise men" should be made an object of the endeavor of such as are wise already. It is an intensified acquaintance with wisdom that is here called for, a knowledge in the sense of the passage, "to him that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance," Matth. xiii. 12; comp. John i. 16; Rom. i. 17; 2 Cor. iii. 18. For the verbal explanation of "enigma" and "dark saying" (מְלִיצָה and חִידָה) see Introd., § 11, note 2. Certain as it is that both expressions here are only designed to embody in a concrete form the idea of obscure discourse that requires interpretation (the parallelism with "proverbs" and "words of wise men" (מָשָׁל and דִּבְרֵי חֲכָמִים) shows this beyond dispute), we have no warrant for finding in this verse a special allusion to the obscure, enigmatical contents of chap. xxx., and so for insisting upon its very late origin, as HITZIG does (see in reply EWALD). Nevertheless, it follows from the comprehensiveness of the plural expression "words of wise men" (comp. xxii. 17 and Eccles. ix. 17; xii. 11) that no one could have prefixed to his work an introduction like that before us, who was not conscious that he had collected with proverbs of Solomon many others that were not directly from him (comp. § 12 of the Introd.).

2. Ver. 7 is not to be regarded as a part of the superscription, as EWALD, BERTHEAU, ELSTER, KEIL, *etc.*, treat it, but is the general proposition introducing the series of didactic discourses that follows:—a motto, as it were, for the first or introductory main division of the book, as UMBREIT happily expresses it; comp. HITZIG *in loc.* The proverb has also passed into the Arabic, and here also frequently stands at the commencement of collections of proverbs, whether because it is ascribed to Mohammed, as is sometimes done in such cases, or because it is cited as coming from Solomon. Compare VON DIEZ, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, II., 459; MEIDANI, *ed. Freytag*, III., 29, 610; ERPENIUS, *Sent. quæd. Arab.*, p. 45. In the Old Testament [and Apocrypha], moreover, the same maxim occurs several times, especially in Prov. ix. 10; Ecclesiast. i. 16, 25; Ps. cxi. 10. From the passage last cited the LXX repeat in our verse the words appended to the first clause: Ἀρχὴ σοφίας φόβος κυρίου, σύνεσις δὲ ἀγαθὴ πᾶσιν τοῖς ποιοῦσιν αὐτήν ["and a good understanding have all they that do it"].—**Beginning.**—(רֵאשִׁית is here equivalent to תְּחִלַּת found in the parallel passage, ix. 10; it is therefore correctly rendered in Ecclesiast. and the LXX by ἀρχή in the sense of "beginning"); compare chap. iv. 7, "the beginning of wisdom;" not, as the words themselves would allow, "that which is highest in wisdom," "the noblest or best wisdom." [The latter is given as a marginal reading in the E. V., and is retained and defended by HOLDEN; so also by TRAPP and others.—A.].—**Fools.**—The word designates properly the hardened, the stupid,—those fools who know nothing of God (Jer. iv. 22), and therefore refuse and contemptuously repel His salutary discipline (comp. above, note to ver. 2).

3. Vers. 8–19. These verses show in an example so shaped as to convey an earnest warning, how we are to guard ourselves against the opposite of the fear of God, against depravity, which is, at the same time, the extremest folly. They contain, therefore, a warning against turning aside to the way of vice, given as the first illustration of the truth expressed in ver. 7.—Vers. 8, 9.—**My son.**—The salutation of the

teacher of wisdom, who is here represented as "father" in order to illustrate to his pupil the inner reality and nature of their mutual relation (comp. 1 Cor. iv. 15; Philem. 10). The "mother" who is mentioned in connection with this "father" is only a natural expansion of the idea of the figure, suggested by the law of poetic parallelism,—and not a designation of wisdom personified, who does not appear before ver. 20. [Wordsworth and many of the older English expositors regard this as a specific address by Solomon to Rehoboam; this interpretation, however, lacks the support of Oriental usage, and too much restricts the scope of the Book of Proverbs. The large majority, however, of English and American commentators (*e. g.*, Trapp, Holden, Bridges, Wordsworth, Muenscher) find here a more specific commendation of filial docility and obedience. Stuart more nearly agrees with our author in making the "father" and "mother" figurative rather than literal terms—A.]. —**Law** (תּוֹרָה), here *doctrina*, instructive precepts in general; as in several other instances in our book it is used of the instruction given by parents to their children, *e. g.*, iii. 1; iv. 2; vii. 2; xxviii. 7, 9.—**For they are a graceful crown to thy head.**—"Wreath of grace" (לִוְיַת חֵן) graceful crown, as in iv. 9. The comparison of the teachings of wisdom with pearls which one hangs as a necklace about the neck, a figure which is a great favorite every where in the East, recurs again in iii. 8; vi. 21; Ecclesiast. vi. 30.

Ver. 10. Transition to an intelligible admonitory example; hence the repetition of the familiar salutation "My son," which occurs once more in ver. 15, at the beginning of the apodosis. **Sinners** (חַטָּאִים).—Sinners by profession, habitual sinners, as in Ps. i. 1; here those in particular whose business is murder (comp. Gen. iv. 7, 8), robbers who are murderers.—Ver. 11. **We will lie in wait for blood**, *etc.*—The two verbs (אָרַב and צָפַן) both signify to lie in wait for, to lay snares artfully (as the huntsman for the game, with noose and net). The adverb (חִנָּם) is probably more correctly construed with the verb (lie in wait without cause, *i. e.*, without having any reason for revenge and enmity), than with the adjective,—although this latter combination is also grammatically admissible. But with the conception "him that is innocent in vain," *i. e.*, the man to whom his innocence shall be of no avail against us, the parallel passages (Ps. xxxv. 19; lxix. 4; Lam. iii. 52) correspond less perfectly than with that to which we have given the preference; comp. Hitzig *in loc.*—Ver. 12.—**Will swallow them, like the pit, living.**—The "living" (חַיִּים) can refer only to the suffix pronoun (in נִבְלָעֵם). The connection with "like the pit" (כִּשְׁאוֹל), to which Umbreit and Hitzig give the preference, gives the peculiarly hard sense "as the pit (swallows) that which lives." Comp. rather Ps. lv. 15: "they must go down living into the pit;" and also Ps. cxxiv. 3; Prov. xxx. 16, and the account of the destruction of Korah's company, Numb. xvi. 30, 33.—**The upright** (תְּמִימִים) is accusative, object of the verb (בָּלַע), and therefore stands evidently as synonymous with נְקִיִּים (innocent, comp. Ps. xix. 13); it is accordingly to be interpreted as referring to moral integrity or uprightness, and not of bodily soundness (as Ewald, Bertheau, and others claim).—**Those that descend into the grave** (יוֹרְדֵי בוֹר)—that sink into the sepulchre, *i. e.*, the dead; comp. Ps. xxviii. 1; lxxxviii. 4; cxliii. 7.

Vers. 13, 14. Reasons for the treacherous proposal of the murderers.—**Thou shalt cast in thy lot among us**—*i. e.*, thou shalt, as one having equal right with us, cast lots for the spoil, comp. Ps. xxii. 18; Nehem. x. 35.—Vers. 15 sq. The warning,—given as an apodosis to the condition supposed in ver. 11. As to the figurative expressions in ver. 15, comp. Ps. i. 1; Jer. xiv. 10; Prov. iv. 26; for ver. 16 compare Is. lix. 7, and the passage suggested by it, Rom. iii. 15. Without adequate grounds, Hitzig conjectures that ver. 16 is spurious, because, he says, it agrees almost literally with Isaiah (as cited), and, on the other hand, is wanting in the Cod. Vatic. of the LXX. Literal quotations from earlier Biblical writers are in Isaiah above all others nothing uncommon; and with quite as little reason will the omission of a verse from the greatly corrupted LXX text of our book furnish ground, without other evidence, for suspecting its genuineness (see Introd., § 13).—Ver. 17. "The winged" (properly "lords of the wing;" בַּעַל כָּנָף, as in Eccles. x. 20) is hardly a figurative designation of those plotted against by the robbers, and threatened by treacherous schemes, so that the meaning would be "in vain do they lie in wait for their victims; these become aware of their danger, and so their prize escapes the assailants" (so Döderlein, Ziegler, Bertheau, Elster, *etc.*). For 1) the causal conj. "for" (כִּי) authorizes us to look for a direct reason for the warning contained in ver. 15; 2) the allusion to the possible failure of the plans of the wicked men would not be a moral motive, but a mere prudential consideration, such as would harmonize very poorly with the general drift of the passage before us; and 3) the expression "before the eyes" (בְּעֵינֵי) stands evidently in significant contrast with "in vain" (חִנָּם); it is designed to set the fact that the net is clearly in sight over against the fact that the birds nevertheless fly into it,—and so to exhibit their course as wholly irrational.—Therefore we should interpret with Umbreit, Ewald, Hitzig, *etc.*; like thoughtless birds that with open eyes fly into the net, so sinners while plotting destruction for others plunge themselves in ruin. Only with this explanation, with which we may compare Job xviii. 8, will the import of ver. 18 agree: there "and these, these also" (וְהֵם) puts the sinners in an emphatic way side by side (not in contrast) with the birds, and the suffixes designate the *own* blood, the *own* souls of the sinners. Between the two verses there is therefore the relation of an imperfectly developed comparison suggested by the "also" (וְ) as in xxv. 25; xxvii.

Digitized by Google

21; comp. Introd., § 14. [The view of English expositors is divided, like that of the German scholars cited by our author. Bishop HALL, TRAPP, HENRY and NOYES, *e. g.* agree with him in finding here a comparison, while D'OYLY and MANT, HOLDEN, BRIDGES, WORDSWORTH, STUART, MUENSCHER find a contrast. The argument based on the particles כִּי and וְ it must be admitted has very little force; for כִּי (see EWALD, § 321, b.) may be used positively or negatively in intense asseveration, "yea, surely," or "nay;" while וְ, it is well known, has a very generous variety of uses, among which is the antithetic, in which case it may be rendered "but" or "and yet" (EWALD, § 330, a.).—A.].—**They lie in wait for their own lives.** The LXX, which at the end of this verse adds the peculiar but hardly genuine clause, ἡ δὲ καταστροφὴ ἀνδρῶν παρανόμων κακή ("and the destruction of transgressors is evil, or great") seems, instead of "they lie in wait for their own lives" (יִצְפְּנוּ לְנַפְשֹׁתָם) to have read "they heap up evil" (יִצְבְּרוּ רַע לָמוֹ); for it renders the second number by "θησαυρίζουσιν ἑαυτοῖς κακά" (they treasure up evils for themselves). Comp. HEIDENHEIM in the article cited in the Introd., § 18, note 1.—Ver. 19. Retrospect and conclusion; comp. Job viii. 13; xviii. 21.—Spoil (בֶּצַע) gain unlawfully acquired, as in xxviii. 16. The combination בֹּצֵעַ בֶּצַע is found also in xv. 27. The subject of the verb "takes" (יִקָּח) is בֶּצַע; "the life of its owner it, unjust gain, takes away." LUTHER, following the LXX, *Vulgate*, and most of the ancient expositors, renders "that one (*i. e.*, of the rapacious) takes life from another." But the idea "ownership, owner" (בְּעָלִים) has no reference to the relation between partners in violence and those like themselves, but to that existing between an object possessed and its possessor.

4. Vers. 20-33. After this warning against the desperate counsels of the wicked there follows in this second admonitory discourse a warning against the irrational and perverse conduct of fools. In the former case it was contempt of the fear of God, in the latter it is contempt of wisdom against which the warning is directed. Both passages, therefore, refer back distinctly to the motto that introduces them in ver. 7. The admonition against folly, which is now to be considered, is put appropriately into the mouth of wisdom personified,—as is also, later in the book, the discourse on the nature and the origin of wisdom (chap. viii. 1 sq).—**On the street** and in public places wisdom makes herself heard; not in secret, for she need not be ashamed of her teaching, and because she is a true friend of the people seeking the welfare of all, and therefore follows the young and simple, the foolish and ungodly, everywhere where they resort; comp. Christ's command to His disciples, Matt. x. 27; Luke xiv. 21. As in these passages of the New Testament, so in that before us, human teachers (the wise men, or the prophets, according to Ecclesiast. xxiv. 33; Wisdom vii. 27) are to be regarded as the intermediate instrumentality in the public preaching of wisdom.—Ver. 21. **In the places of greatest tumult she calleth,** *etc.* "The tumultuous" (הֹמִיּוֹת), comp. Isaiah xxii. 2; 1 Kings i. 41, can signify here nothing but the public streets full of tumult, the thoroughfares. The "beginning" (רֹאשׁ) of these highways or thoroughfares is, as it were, their corner; the whole expression points to boisterous public places. The LXX seem to have read חוֹמוֹת "walls," since it translates ἐπ' ἄκρων τειχέων [on high walls]. Before the second clause the same version has the addition "ἐπὶ δὲ πύλαις δυναστῶν παρεδρεύει" [and at the gates of the mighty she sits], an expansion of the figure in which there is no special pertinence. **In the city** (בָּעִיר) is probably to be regarded as a closer limitation of "at the entrances of the gates" (בְּפִתְחֵי שְׁעָרִים), *i. e.*, on the inner, the city side of the entrances at the gates: it is not then to be regarded as an antithesis, as UMBREIT, BERTHEAU, HITZIG, *etc.*, claim, [nor is it to be detached and connected with the next clause, as STUART claims].—Ver. 22. **How long, ye simple, will ye love simplicity?** The discourse of Wisdom begins in the same way as Ps. iv. 2. In regard to the distinction between "simple" (פֶּתִי) and "scorner" (לֵץ), comp. Introd. § 3, note 2; and above, the remarks on ver. 4.—The perfect tense in the second clause (חָמְדוּ), which standing between the imperfects of the 1st and 3d clauses is somewhat unusual, is to be conceived of as inchoative (like the verb "despise" בָּזוּ in ver. 7), and therefore properly signifies "become fond of," and not "be fond of." [See, however, the critical note on this verse].—Ver. 23. **Turn ye at my reproof,**—*i. e.*, from your evil and perverse way. **I will pour out upon you my spirit.** The spirit of wisdom is to flow forth copiously, like a never-failing spring; comp. xviii. 4; and with reference to the verb "pour out" (הִבִּיעַ) which "unites in itself the figures of abundant fullness and refreshing invigoration" (UMBREIT, ELSTER) comp. xv. 2; Ps. lxxviii. 2; cxix. 171.—Ver. 24, in connection with 25, is an antecedent clause introduced by "because" (יַעַן), to which vers. 26, 27 correspond as conclusion. The perfects and imperfects with ו *consec.* in the protasis describe a past only in relation to the verbs of the apodosis, and may therefore well be rendered by the present, as LUTHER has done: "Because I call and ye refuse," *etc.* To **stretch forth the hand,** in order to beckon to one, is a sign of calling for attention,—as in Isa. lxv. 2. The verb in ver. 25, f. c. (פָּרַע) is doubtless not "undervalue, despise" as HITZIG explains, following the analogy of the Arabic), but "cast off, reject," as in iv. 15, (UMBREIT, EWALD, ELSTER and commentators generally; comp. LUTHER's "let go, *fahren lassen*"). [As between the two the English Version is equivocal, "set at naught"].—Ver. 26. "Laugh" and "mock" (שָׂחַק and לָעַג) here as in Ps. ii. 4.—Ver. 27 depicts the style and manner in which calamity comes upon fools, "and accumulates

Digitized by Google

expression to work upon the fancy" (HITZIG). Instead of the K'thibh כשאוה according to the K'ri we should read כְּשׁוֹאָה, and this should be interpreted in the sense of "tempest" (comp. iii. 25; Zeph. i. 15). Thus most commentators correctly judge, while HITZIG defends for the expression the signification "cataract," which however is appropriate in none of the passages adduced, and also fails in Job xxx. 14 (comp. DELITZSCH on this passage).—In regard to the alliteration צָרָה וְצוּקָה **distress and anguish**, comp. Isa. xxx. 6; Zeph. i. 15.—Ver. 28. **They shall seek me diligently.** שִׁחֵר, a denominative verb from שַׁחַר, "the morning dawn," signifies to seek something while it is yet early, in the obscurity of the morning twilight, and so illustrates eager, diligent seeking. [Of the recent commentators in English, NOYES only retains and emphasizes the rendering of the E. V., "they shall seek me *early*." The rest do not find the idea of *time* in the verb, except by suggestion.—A.]. Comp., with respect to the general idea of the verse, Prov. viii. 17; Hos. v. 15. [Observe also the force of the transition from the 2d person of the preceding verse, to the 3d person in this and the verses following.—A.].—Ver. 29. The "because" (תַּחַת כִּי) is not dependent on ver. 28, but introduces the four-fold antecedent clause (vers. 29, 30), which ver. 31 follows as its conclusion. With ver. 31 comp. Is. iii. 10; Ps. lxxxviii. 3; cxxiii. 4, where the figure of satiety with a thing expresses likewise the idea of experiencing the evil consequences of a mode of action. מוֹעֵצוֹת, **evil devices**, as also Ps. v. 10.—Vers. 32, 33. Confirmatory and concluding propositions, connected by "for" (כִּי).—מְשׁוּבָה, turning away from wisdom and its salutary discipline, therefore resistance, rebelliousness. Comp. Jer. viii. 5, Hos. xi. 5, where it signifies turning away or departure from God. "Security" (שַׁלְוָה) idle, easy rest, the carnal security of the obdurate; comp. Jerem. xxii. 21. A beautiful contrast to this false ease is presented in the true peace of the wise and devout, as ver. 33 describes it.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

As long ago as the time of MELANCHTHON it was recognized as a significant fact, that wisdom claims as her hearers and pupils not only the simple, the young and the untaught, but those also who are already advanced in the knowledge of truth, the wise and experienced. He remarks on ver. 5: "To his proposition he adds an admonition what the hearer ought to be. A wise hearer will profit, as saith the Lord: To him that hath shall be given. And again, He shall give the Holy Spirit to those that seek, not to those that despise, not to those that oppose with barbarous and savage fierceness. These despisers of God, the Epicureans and the like, he here says do not profit, but others, in whom are the beginnings of the fear of God, and who seek to be controlled by God, as it is said: Ask and ye shall receive."* Susceptibility therefore both must manifest,—those who are beginners under the instruction of wisdom, and those who are more advanced; otherwise there is no progress for them. It is indeed divine wisdom in regard to the acquisition of which these assertions are made; and in the possession of this wisdom, and in the communication of it as a teacher, no man here below ever attains perfection, so as to need no further teaching. It is precisely as it is within the department of the New Testament with the duty of faith, and of growth in believing knowledge, which duty in no stage of the Christian life in this world ever loses its validity and its binding power. Comp. Luke xvii. 5; Eph. iv. 15, 16; Col. i. 11; ii. 19; 2 Thess. i. 3; 2 Pet. iii. 18.

2. **The thoroughly religious character of wisdom** as our book designs to inculcate it, appears not only in the jewel which sparkles foremost in its necklace of proverbs (ver. 7: "The fear of Jehovah is the beginning of wisdom, *etc.*"), but also in the fact that in the introductory admonition, in ver. 10, it is **Sinners** (so designated without preamble or qualification), the חַטָּאִים (LUTHER, "the base knaves," *die bösen Buben*), whose seductive conduct is put in contrast with the normal deportment of the disciple of wisdom. Observe further that in the very superscription, vers. 2 and 3, the ideas of discipline, righteousness, justice and uprightness are appended to that of wisdom as synonymous with it. The wise man is therefore *eo ipso*, also the just, the pious, the upright, the man who walks the way of truth. Inasmuch, however, as the ideas of righteousness, justice and uprightness (צֶדֶק, מִשְׁפָּט, מֵישָׁרִים), here, as every where else in the Old Testament, express the idea of correspondence with the revealed moral law, *the* law, the law of Moses, therefore the wise man is the man who acts and walks in accordance with law, the true observer of the law, who "walks in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless" (Luke i. 6; comp. Deut. v. 33; xi. 22; Ps. cxix. 1). True wisdom, knowledge, and spiritual culture, are to be found within the sphere of Old Testament revelation only where the law of the Lord is truly observed. Mere morality in the sense of the modern humanitarian free-thinking and polite culture could not at all show itself there; moral rectitude must also always be at the same time legal rectitude. Nay it stands enacted also under the New Testament that "whosoever shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven" (Matth. v. 19); that "the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy and faith," together with its less significant demands, must be fulfilled (Matth. xxiii. 23); that he only can be called a possessor of "the wisdom that is from above," and "a perfect man," who "offends not in word" (James iii. 2, 17). The fear of the Lord, which according to ver. 7 is the beginning of wisdom, while again in ver. 29 it is

* *Propositioni addit admonitionem, qualem oporteat auditorem esse. Sapiens auditor proficiet, sicut Dominus inquit: Habenti dabitur. Item: Dabit spiritum sanctum petentibus, non contemnentibus, non repugnantibus barbarica et cyclopica ferocia. Hos contemptores Dei, ut Epicureos et similes, ait hic non proficere, sed alios, in quibus sunt initia timoris Dei, et qui petunt se regi a Deo, sicut dicitur Petite et accipietis.*

Digitized by Google

presented as the synonyme of the same idea (comp. ii. 5; ix. 10, *etc.*) consists, once for all, in a complete devotion to God, an unconditional subjection of one's own individuality to the beneficent will of God as revealed in the law (comp. Deut. vi. 2, 13; x. 20; xiii. 4; Ps. cxix. 63, *etc.*). How then can he be regarded as fearing God, who should keep only a part of the divine commands, or who should undertake to fulfil them only according to their moral principle, and did not seek also to make the embodying letter of their formal requirements the standard of his life—in the Old Testament with literal strictness, in the New Testament in spirit and in truth?

From these observations it will appear what right Bruch has to maintain (in the work before cited, p. 128), that in the collection of the Proverbs of Solomon, and in general in the gnomic writers of Israel, the idea of wisdom is *substituted* for that of righteousness which is common in other parts of the Old Testament. Righteousness and wisdom according to this view would be essentially exclusive the one of the other; since the former conception "had usually attached itself to a ceremonial righteousness through works," and had appeared "to make too little reference to the theoretical conditions of all higher moral culture." In the Introduction, (§ 15, note) we have already commented on the one-sidedness and the misconception involved in this view, according to which the doctrine of wisdom (the Hhokmah-system) was Antinomian and rationalistic in the sense of the purely negative Protestantism of modern times. Further arguments in its refutation we shall have occasion to adduce in the exposition of the several passages there cited (see particularly xiv. 9; xxviii. 4 sq.; xxix. 18, 24, *etc.*) See also the doctrinal observations on iii. 9.

3. That **the reckless transgressor destroys himself by his ungodly course**, that he runs with open eyes into the net of destruction spread out before him, and, as it were, lies in wait for his own life to strangle it,—this truth clearly presented in vers. 17, 18 is a characteristic and favorite tenet in the teaching of wisdom in the Old Testament. Comp. particularly chap. viii. 36, where wisdom exclaims "Whoso sinneth against me, wrongeth his own soul; all they that hate me love death." So also xv. 32; xxvi. 27; Eccles. x. 8; Ps. vii. 15; Ecclesiast. xxvii. 29 (the figure of the pit which the wicked digs, to fall into it at last himself). But in the Prophets also essentially the same thought recurs; thus when Jehovah (in Ezek. xviii. 31; xxxiii. 11) exclaims "Why will ye die, ye of the house of Israel?" Of passages from the New Testament we may cite here Rom. ii. 5; 1 Tim. vi. 9, 10; Gal. vi. 8; James v. 3–5, *etc.* Both propositions are alike true, that true wisdom, being one with the fear of God and righteousness, is "a tree of life to all that lay hold upon her" (Prov. iii. 18; xi. 30; xv. 4; comp. iv. 13, 22; xix. 23, *etc.*),—and that on the other hand a walking in folly and in forgetfulness of God is a slow self-murder, a destruction of one's own life and happiness. See the two concluding propositions of our chapter (vers. 32, 33) and the admirable poetic development of this contrast in the Ps. i. 4. The explanation given above (on ver. 20) of the fact that wisdom is exhibited as preaching upon the streets, *i. e.*, in reference to her benevolent and philanthropic character, which impels her to follow sinners, and to make the great masses of the needy among the people the object of her instructive and converting activity, seems to us to correspond better with the spirit of the doctrine of wisdom in the Old Testament, than either that of Umbreit, according to which "it is only in busy life that the rich stream of experience springs forth, from which wisdom is drawn," or that of Ewald, which recognizes, in the free public appearance of wisdom an effective contrast to the light-shunning deeds, and the secret consultations of the sinners who have just been described, (which explanation, besides, would apply only to this passage, and not to its parallels in viii. 2, 3, and ix. 3). The tendency of the Old Testament Hhokmah was essentially popular, looking to the increased prosperity of the nation, to the promotion of philanthropic ends in the noblest sense of the word. Love, true philanthropy is everywhere the key-note to its doctrines and admonitions. "Forgiving, patient love (x. 12), love that does good even to enemies (xxv. 11 sq.), which does not rejoice over an enemy's calamity (xxiv. 17 sq.), which does not recompense like with like (xxiv. 28 sq.), but commits all to God (xx. 22), love in its manifold varieties, as conjugal love, parental love, the love of a friend, is here recommended with the clearness of the New Testament and the most expressive cordiality." (Delitzsch, as above cited, p. 716). Why then should not that yearning and saving love for sinners which ventures into the whirl and tumult of great crowds to bear testimony to divine truth, and to reclaim lost souls,—why should not this also constitute a chief characteristic in this spiritual state modelled so much like the standard of the New Testament? It appears—in how many passages!—as the type of, nay, as one with the spirit of Him who also "spake freely and openly before the world, in the synagogue and in the temple whither the Jews always resorted" (John xviii. 20); who, when He said something in secret to His disciples, did it only to the end that they should afterward "preach it upon the housetops" (Matth. x. 27); who allowed himself to be taunted as "a man gluttonous, and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners," because He had come to seek and to save the lost (Matth. xi. 19; Luke xix. 10). It is at least significant that the Lord, just in that passage in which he is treating of the publicity of His working, and of the impression which His condescending intercourse with publicans, sinners and the mass of the people had made upon the Jews, designates Himself distinctly (together with His herald and forerunner, John the Baptist) as the personal Wisdom; Matth. xi. 19; Luke vii. 35. It is as though He had by this expression intended to call up in fresh remembrance Solomon's representation of wisdom preaching in the streets, and to refer to His own identity with the spirit of the Old Testament revelation that spoke through this wisdom (the "spirit of Christ," 1 Pet. i. 11). Comp. Mart. Geier and Starke on this passage. These authors appropriately remind us of the universality of the New Testament's proclamation

Digitized by Google

of salvation, and its call penetrating everywhere (Rom. x. 18; Col. i. 6, 28); they are in error, however, in suspecting in the supposed plural הָכְמוֹת (ver. 18) an intimation of the numberless ways in which wisdom is proclaimed in the world. The true conception of this seeming plural may be found above in the Exegetical and Critical Notes on this passage.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Homily upon the entire *first chapter*. Solomon's discourse upon wisdom as the highest good. 1) Its design, for young and old, learned and unlearned (vers. 1–6). 2) Its substance: commendation of the fear of God as the beginning and essence of all wisdom (ver. 7). 3) Its aim: *a*) warning against betrayal into profligacy as being the opposite of the fear of God (vers. 8–19); *b*) warning against the foolish conduct of the world as being the opposite of wisdom (vers. 20-33).—The wisdom of the Old Testament as a type of true Christian feeling and action: *a*) with respect to God as the supreme author and chief end of all moral effort (vers. 1–9); *b*) with respect to the world, as the seducing power, that draws away from communion with God (vers. 10–19); *c*) with respect to the way and manner in which Divine wisdom itself reveals itself as an earnest and yet loving preacher of righteousness (vers. 20-33).—Fear of God the one thing that is needful in all conditions of life: *a*) in youth as well as in age (vers. 4 sq.); *b*) in circumstances of temptation (vers. 10 sq.); *c*) in the tumult and unrest of public life (vers. 20 sq.); *d*) in prosperity and adversity (vers. 27 sq.).

Stöcker:—Threefold attributes of the lover of wisdom: 1) in relation to God: the fear of God (1-7); 2) in relation to one's neighbors,—and specifically, *a*) to one's parents; obedience (8, 9); *b*) to others: the avoidance of evil company (10-19); 3) in relation to one's self; diligent use of the opportunity to become acquainted with wisdom.

Separate passages.—Vers. 1-6. See above, Doctrinal and Ethical principles. 1.—

Starke:—The aim of the book, and that which should be learned from it, are pointed out in these verses in various almost equivalent words. The aim is, however, substantially twofold: 1) that the evil in man be put away; 2) that good be learned and practised.—Wohlfarth:—the necessity of the culture of our mind and heart. Not the cultivated, but the undisciplined, oppose the law! God "will have all men come to the knowledge of the truth," 1 Tim. ii. 4.—[Ver. 4. Cartwright (quoted by Bridges): —"Over the gates of Plato's school it was written—Μηδείς ἀγεωμέτρητος εἰσίτω—Let no one who is not a geometrician enter. But very different is the inscription over these doors of Solomon—Let the ignorant, simple, foolish, young, enter!"]

Vers. 7-9. The blessedness of the fear of God, and the unblessed condition of forgetfulness of God,—illustrated in the relation 1) of children to their parents; 2) of subjects to authorities; 3) of Christians to Christ, the Lord of the Church. —The proposition "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom" must constitute the foundation of all the culture of the children of God, as the experience of the truth that "to love Christ is better than all knowledge" is to constitute its capstone and completion.—Vers. 8, 9, in general a peculiarly appropriate text for a sermon on education.—Luther (a marginal comment on ver. 7): "He who would truly learn must first be a man fearing God. He, however, who despises God asks for no wisdom, suffers no chastisement nor discipline."—Melanchthon (on ver. 7):—The fear of God, which is one with true reverence for God, includes: 1) right knowledge of God; 2) a genuine standing in fear before God; 3) faith, or the believing consecration to God, which distinguishes this fear from all servile dread, and fleeing from God; 4) the worship of God which aids to a true reconciliation with Him, a well ordered and assured control of the whole life. Therefore the fear of God is not merely beginning—it is quite the sum of all wisdom, the right manager of all our counsels in prosperity and adversity.—Melanchthon (again) on vers. 8, 9:—He only reveals genuine fear of God who hearkens to the divinely instituted ministry (*ministerium docendi*) in the Church; and to this ministry parents also belong, so far forth as they are to "bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord," Eph. vi. 4. "Forsake not the law of thy mother," *i. e.*, hearken always to the word of God as it has been communicated to the Church, and through the Church to all the children of God in the writings of the Prophets and Apostles. As a reward God here promises to those who practise this obedience to His word a wreath upon the head and a beautiful necklace about the neck. The wreath betokens dominion, distinction, successful results in all that one undertakes for himself and others, so that he becomes an instrument of blessing and a vessel of mercy for the people of God, according to the type of the devout kings, David, Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, *etc.*, and not a vessel of wrath after the likeness of a Saul, Absalom, *etc.* The necklace signifies the gift of discourse, or of the command of wholesome doctrine, through the power of the word.—Starke (on ver. 7):—True wisdom is no such thing as the heathen sages taught, built upon reason and the human powers, inflated, earthly, and useless with respect to salvation; but it is "the wisdom that is from above, which is first pure, then peaceable, gentle and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality and without hypocrisy" (James iii. 17). The fear of God is, however, of two kinds, the servile and the childlike; and only the latter is here meant, 1 John iv. 18.—On Vers. 8, 9. From the fear of God as belonging to the first table of the law, Solomon passes on to the second table, and begins with obedience to parents: in this connection however it is assumed that parents also fulfil their duty, with regard to the correct instruction of their children; Eph. vi. 4.—Zeltner:—Many simple ones, who, however, fear God from the heart, have made such progress in the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, that they have outstripped many of the learned. True wisdom is easy to be learned, if only there be true fear of God in the heart, Ecclesiast. i. 22 sq.—Lange:—(*Salom. Licht und Recht*). The fear of God is a desire

Digitized by Google

flowing from the knowledge of the essence of all essences—of the will and the gracious acts of God,—a sincere desire heartily to love Him as the highest good, in deepest humility to honor Him, in child-like confidence to hope the best from Him, and to serve Him with denial of self, willingly and steadfastly; and all this in conformity to His revealed will. Comp. above, MELANCHTHON, and also S. BOHLIUS, *Ethica Sacra:* "To fear God is nothing but to follow God, or to imitate none but God."*

[Ver. 7. ARNOT:—"What God is inspires awe; what God has done for His people commands affection. See here the centrifugal and centripetal forces of the moral world, holding the creature reverently distant from the Creator, yet compassing the child about with everlasting love, to keep him near a Father in heaven."—Ver. 8. "This verse of the Proverbs flows from the same well spring that had already given forth the fifth commandment."]

Vers. 10-19 *Calwer Handbuch:* The first rule for youth, "Follow father and mother," is immediately followed by the second, "Follow not base fellows."—STARKE:—As a good education of children lays the first foundation for their true well being, so temptation lays the first foundation for their destruction.—The world, in order the better to lead others astray, is wont to adorn its vices with the finest colors. There be most of all on thy guard; where the world is most friendly it is most dangerous. It is a poisoned sweetmeat.—If thou art God's child, engrafted in Christ the living vine by holy baptism, thou hast received from Him new powers to hate evil and conquer all temptations.—On vers. 16-19:—The ungodly have in their wickedness their calamity also,—and must (by its law) prepare this for one another.—LUTHER (marginal comment on ver. 17): "This is a proverb, and means "It fares with them as is said, 'In vain is the net,' *etc.; i. e.*, their undertaking will fail, they will themselves perish."

[Ver. 10. ARNOT:—This verse, in brief compass and transparent terms, reveals the foe and the fight. With a kindness and wisdom altogether paternal, it warns the youth of the *Danger* that assails him, and suggests the method of *Defence.*]

Ver. 20 sq. GEIER (on ver. 20, 21):—"All this declares the fervor and diligence of heavenly wisdom in alluring and drawing all to itself: just as a herald with full lungs and clear voice endeavors to summon all to him"—LANGE:—Eternal wisdom sends forth a call of goodness and grace to the pious, and a call to holiness and righteousness addressed to the ungodly. O that all would read and use aright this record written out thus in capitals!—*Calwer Handb.:*—Wisdom's walk through the streets. The Lord and His Spirit follows us every where with monition and reminder. Here wisdom is portrayed especially as warning against the evil consequences of disobedience, and as pointing to the blessings of obedience.—WOHLFARTH: The words of grief over the unthankfulness and blindness of men which Solomon here puts into the mouth of wisdom,—we hear them, alas! even to-day. Truth has become . . . . the common property of all men: in thousands upon thousands of churches and schools, from the mouth of innumerable teachers, in millions of written works, it speaks, instructs, warns, pleads, adjures, so that we with wider meaning than Solomon can say, it is preached in highways and byways. If, on the one hand, we must greatly rejoice over this, how should we not in the same measure mourn that so many despise and scorn this call of wisdom! Is it not fearful to observe how parents innumerable keep their children from schools—how many despise the preaching of the gospel, *etc.?* Let us therefore learn how slow man is to good, how inclined to evil, how careless he is just in connection with his richest privileges, *etc.*

Vers. 22 sq. STARKE:—Wisdom divides men here into three classes: 1) The simple or foolish: 2) mockers; 3) the abandoned. Through her call, "Turn you at my reproof," *etc.*, she aims to transform these into prudent, thoughtful, devout men.—No one can receive the Holy Spirit of Christ and be enlightened with Divine wisdom, and not turn to the sacrifice of Christ (John xiv. 15 sq.—xvi. 7 sq.), renounce evil, and begin a new life (Ps. xxxiv. 15).—LANGE:—If man does not follow the counsel of eternal wisdom, but walks according to the impulse of his own will, he comes at last to the judgment of obduracy.—W. STEIN (Fast day sermon on i. 23-33):—How does eternal, heavenly wisdom aim to awaken us to penitence? 1) She uncovers our sins; 2) she proclaims heavy judgments; 3) she offers us shelter and points out the way of eternal salvation.—[Ver. 23. FLAVEL:—This great conjunction of the word and Spirit makes that blessed season of salvation the time of love and of life.—J. HOWE:—When it is said, "Turn," *etc.*, could any essay to turn be without some influence of the Spirit? But that complied with tends to pouring forth a copious effusion not to be withstood.—ARNOT:—The command is given not to make the promise unnecessary, but to send us to it for help. The promise is given not to supersede the command, but to encourage us in the effort to obey.—When we turn at His reproof, He will pour out His Spirit; when He pours out His Spirit, we will turn at His reproof; blessed circle for saints to reason in.—Ver. 24-28. ARNOT:—When mercy was sovereign, mercy used judgment for carrying out mercy's ends; when mercy's reign is over and judgment's reign begins, then judgment will sovereignly take mercy past, and wield it to give weight to the vengeance stroke.—Ver. 32. SOUTH:—Prosperity ever dangerous to virtue: 1) because every foolish or vicious person is either ignorant or regardless of the proper ends and rules for which God designs the prosperity of those to whom He sends it; 2) because prosperity, as the nature of man now stands, has a peculiar force and fitness to abate men's virtues and heighten their corruptions; 3) because it directly indisposes them to the proper means of amendment and recovery.—BAXTER:—Because they are fools they turn God's mercies to their own destruction; and because they prosper, they are confirmed in their folly.]

* "*Timere Deum nihil aliud est quam sequi Deum sive neminem imitari præter Deum.*"

Digitized by Google

8. Exhibition of the blessed consequences of obedience and of striving after wisdom.

CHAP. II. 1–22.

1 My son, if thou receivest my words
and keepest my commandments by thee,
2 so that thou inclinest thine ear to wisdom,
and turnest thine heart to understanding;
3 yea, if thou callest after knowledge,
to understanding liftest up thy voice;
4 if thou seekest her as silver,
and searchest for her as for hidden treasure;
5 then shalt thou understand the fear of Jehovah,
and find knowledge of God;—
6 for Jehovah giveth wisdom,
from his mouth (cometh) knowledge and understanding:
7 and so he layeth up for the righteous sound wisdom,
a shield (is he) for them that walk uprightly,
8 to protect the paths of justice,
and guard the way of his saints;—
9 then shalt thou understand righteousness and justice
and uprightness,—every good way.
10 If wisdom entereth into thine heart,
and knowledge is pleasant to thy soul,
11 then will discretion watch over thee,
understanding will keep thee,
12 to deliver thee from an evil way,
from the man that uttereth frowardness,
13 (from those) who forsake straight paths,
to walk in ways of darkness;
14 who rejoice to do evil,
who delight in deceitful wickedness;
15 whose paths are crooked,
and they froward in their ways;—
16 to deliver thee from the strange woman,
from the stranger who maketh her words smooth,
17 who hath forsaken the companion of her youth
and forgotten the covenant of her God.
18 For her house sinketh down to death
and to the dead (lead) her paths;
19 her visitors all return not again,
and lay not hold upon paths of life.
20 (This is) that thou mayest walk in a good way
and keep the paths of the righteous!
21 For the upright shall inhabit the land,
and the just shall remain in it:
22 but the wicked are cut off from the land,
and the faithless are driven out of it.

GRAMMATICAL AND CRITICAL.

[Ver. 1 sq. DE WETTE and NOYES conceive of the first two verses as not conditional, but as containing the expression of a direct and independent wish: *Oh that thou wouldest receive, etc.* The LXX, *Vulg*, LUTHER, *etc.*, make the first verse conditional, but find the apodosis in ver. 2. MUENSCHER finds in ver. 2 an independent condition, and not a mere sequence to the preceding; so HOLDEN, with a slightly different combination of the parts of ver. 2: *If by inclining thine ear . . . thou wilt incline thine heart, etc.* M., H., STUART and others find the apodosis of the series of conditional clauses in ver. 5,

Digitized by Google

agreeing in this with the E. V. These diverse views do not essentially modify the general import of the passage. ZÖCKLER it will be observed finds the apodosis in vers. 5 and 9, vers. 6-8 being parenthetical.—A.].

Ver. 7. For the construction with the stat. constr. compare Isa. xxxiii. 15. [Compare GREEN, §§ 254, 9, b and 274, 2.]

Ver. 8. The infinitive לִנְצֹר is followed by the imperf. יִשְׁמֹר as above in ver. 2. [For explanations of the nature and use of this infinitive construction see EWALD, § 237, c. The literal rendering would be "for the guarding, protection, keeping." Whose keeping the paths, *etc.?* HOLDEN understands it of the righteous: "who walk uprightly by keeping the paths, *etc.*" Most commentators understand it of God, who is "a shield for the protection, *i. e.*, to protect, *etc.*" ZÖCKLER in translation conforms the following Kal pret. to this infin., while most others reverse the process.—A.]

Ver. 10. [The כִּי with which the verse commences is differently understood, as conditional or temporal, or as causal. Thus E. V., N., M., "*when wisdom, etc.;*" S., K., VAN ESS, "*for wisdom, etc.;*" DE W., Z., "*if wisdom, etc.*" Between the first and last there is no essential difference, and this view of the author is probably entitled to the preference.—A.].

The feminine דַּעַת, "knowledge" (which is used here, as in i. 7, as synonymous with חָכְמָה "wisdom") has connected with it the masculine verbal form יִנְעָם, because this expression "it is lovely" is treated as impersonal, or neuter, and דַּעַת is connected with it as an accusative of object [acc. synecd., "there is pleasure to thy soul in respect to knowledge"]. Comp. the similar connection of דַּעַת with the masculine verbal form נָקָל in chap. xiv. 6;—also Gen. xlix. 15, 2 Sam. xi. 25.

Ver. 11. [For the verbal form תִּנְצְרֶכָּה, with נ unassimilated, "for the sake of emphasis or euphony," see BÖTT., § 1100, 3.—A.].

Ver. 12. רָע is a substantive subordinate to the stat. constr. דֶּרֶךְ as in viii. 13, or as in תַּהְפֻּכוֹת רָע ver. 14, in אִישׁ־רָע, chap. xxviii. 5, *etc.*

Ver. 18. שָׁחָה־בֵיתָהּ. בַּיִת which is everywhere else masculine is here exceptionally treated as feminine; for שָׁחָה is certainly to be regarded as 3d sing. fem. from שׁוּחַ, and not with UMBREIT and ELSTER as a 3d sing. masc., for only שַׁח and not שָׁחָה (to stoop, to bow) has the signification here required, *viz.*, that of sinking (Lat. *sidere*). The LXX read שָׁתָה from שָׁתַת, and therefore translate: ἔθετο γὰρ παρὰ τῷ θανάτῳ τὸν οἶκον αὐτῆς [she set her house near to death] in which construction however שָׁתַת *sidere*, is incorrectly taken as transitive. [Both BÖTTCHER and FUERST recognize the possibility of deriving this form as a 3d sing. fem., either from שׁוּחַ or from שָׁחַח, which have a similar intrans. meaning. To שָׁתַת neither RÖDIGER (GESEN. *Thes.*) nor ROBINSON'S *Gesenius*, nor FUERST gives any other than a transitive meaning.—A.]. Perhaps BÖTTCHER (*De Inferis*, §§ 201, 292; *Neue Aehrenl.*, p. 1) has hit upon the true explanation, when he in like manner makes the wanton woman the subject, but treats בֵּיתָהּ not as object but as supplementary to the verb, and therefore translates "for she sinks to death with her house, and to the dead with her paths. [RÖD. (*Thesaur.* p. 1377, a) expresses his agreement with B., but states his view differently: "*de ipsa muliere cogitavit scriptor initio hemistichii prioris, tum vero in fine ad complendum sententiam loco mulieris subjectum fecit* בֵּיתָהּ." FUERST also pronounces it unnecessary to think of any other subject than בֵּיתָהּ.—A.]. Compare however HITZIG'S comment on this passage, who remarks in defence of the common reading that בַּיִת is here exceptionally treated as feminine, because not so much the house itself is intended as "the conduct and transactions in it" (comp. vii. 27; Isa. v. 14).

Ver. 22. With יִכָּרֵתוּ, the expression which is employed also in Ps. xxxvii. 9, to convey the idea of destruction, there corresponds in the 2d clause יִסְּחוּ, which as derived from נָסַח (Deut. xxviii 63; Ps. lii. 5; Prov. xv. 25) would require to be taken as Imperf. Kal and accordingly to be translated actively: "they drive them out," *i. e.*, they are driven out (so *e. g.*, UMBREIT, ELSTER, and so essentially BERTHEAU also). But inasmuch as the parallelism requires a passive verb as predicate for בּוֹגְדִים (*i. e.*, the faithless, those who have proved recreant to the theocratic covenant with Jehovah, comp. xi. 3, 6; xiii. 2; xxii. 12) which is employed unmistakably as synonymous with רְשָׁעִים,—and inasmuch as no verb סָחַח exists as a basis for the assumed Niphal form יִסְּחוּ, we must probably read with HITZIG יֻסְּחוּ, as an Imperf. Hophal from נָסַח and compare יֻקַּח as an Imperf. Hophal of לָקַח (used with the Pual of the same verb).

EXEGETICAL.

1. Vers. 1-9. This first smaller division of the chapter forms a connected proposition, whose hypothetical protasis includes vers. 1-4, while within the double apodosis (vers. 5 and 9) the confirmatory parenthesis, vers. 6-8 is introduced. The assertion of EWALD and BERTHEAU [with whom KAMPHAUSEN and STUART agree] that the entire chap. forms only one grand proposition, rests on the false assumption that the "if" כִּי in ver. 10 is to be regarded as a causal particle, and should be translated by "for,"—to which idea the relation of ver. 10 both to ver. 9 and to ver. 11 is opposed. Comp. UMBREIT and HITZIG on this passage. [On the other hand, the LXX, Vulg., LUTHER, *etc.*, complete the first proposition, protasis and apodosis, within the first two verses; the Vulgate *e. g.* renders "*si susceperis . . . inclina cor tuum, etc.,*" and LUTHER "*willst du meine Rede annehmen . . . So lass dein Ohr* u. s. w." The E. V. ends the proposition with ver. 5 as the apodosis.—A.].—**If thou receivest my words.** To the idea of "receiving" that of "keeping" stands related as the more emphatic, just as "commandments" (מִצְוֹת) is a stronger expression than "words" (אֲמָרִים). In the three following verses also we find this same increased emphasis or intensifying of the expression in the second clause as compared with the first,—especially in ver. 4, the substance of which as a whole presents itself before us as a superlative, or final culmination of the gradation which exists in the whole series of antecedent clauses, in so far as this verse sets forth the most diligent and intent seeking after wisdom.—Ver. 3. **Yea, if thou callest after knowledge,** *i. e.*, if thou not only inclinest thine ear to her when she calls thee, but also on thine own part callest after her, summonest her to teach thee, goest to

Digitized by Google

meet her with eager questioning. This relation of climax to the preceding is indicated by the כִּי אִם, *imo*, yea, rather; comp. Hos. ix. 12; Is. xxviii. 28; Job xxxix. 14 [comp. EWALD, § 343, *b*]. The Targum translates the passage "If thou callest understanding thy mother," and must therefore have read כִּי אֵם. But the Masoretic pointing is to be preferred for lexical reasons (instead of אֵם, according to the analogy of Job xvi. 14 we should have expected אִמִּי, "my mother"), and because of the parallelism between vers. 1 and 3. Still "knowledge" (בִּינָה), as well as "understanding," which is named as its counterpart in the parallel clause, appears evidently as personified.—Ver. 4. **If thou seekest her**, *etc.*—"The figure of diligent seeking is taken from the tireless exertion employed in mining, which has before been described in the Book of Job, chap. xxviii., with most artistic vivacity in its widest extent. The מַטְמֹנִים are surely the treasures of metal concealed in the earth (comp. Jerem. xli. 8; Jos. vii. 21)," UMBREIT. [For illustrations of the peculiar significance of this comparison to the mind of Orientals, see THOMSON's *Land and Book*, I., 197.—A.].

Ver. 5. **Then wilt thou understand the fear of Jehovah.** — "Understand" is here equivalent to taking something to one's self as a spiritual possession, like the "finding" in the second clause, or like δέχεσθαι ["receiveth"] in 1 Cor. ii. 14. The "fear of Jehovah" (comp. i. 7) is here clearly presented as the highest good and most valuable possession of man (comp. Is. xxxiii. 6), evidently because of its imperishable nature (Ps. xix. 9), and its power to deliver in trouble (Prov. xiv. 26; Ps. cxv. 11; Ecclesiast. i. 11 sq.; ii. 7 sq.).—**And find knowledge of God.**—Knowledge of God is here put not merely as a parallel idea to the "fear of Jehovah" (as in chap. ix. 10; Is. xi. 2), but it expresses a fruit and result of the fear of Jehovah, as the substance of the following causal proposition in vers. 6–8 indicates. Comp. the dogmatical and ethical comments. [Is the substitution of *Elohim* for *Jehovah* (in clause 6) a mere rhetorical or poetical variation? WORDSWORTH calls attention to the fact that this is one of five instances in the Book of Proverbs in which God is designated as *Elohim*, the appellation Jehovah occurring nearly ninety times. The almost singular exception seems then to be intentional, and the meaning will be, the knowledge of "*Elohim*—as distinguished from the knowledge of man which is of little worth." In explaining the all but universal use of *Jehovah* as the name of God in our book, while in Eccles. it never occurs, WORDSWORTH says, "when Solomon wrote the Book of Proverbs he was in a state of favor and grace with Jehovah, the Lord God of Israel; he was obedient to the law of Jehovah; and the special design of the Book of Proverbs is to enforce obedience to that law," *etc.* (see Introd. to Eccles., p. 78).—A.].

Vers. 6-8. The Divine origin of wisdom must make it the main object of human search and effort, and all the more since its possession ensures to the pious at the same time protection and safety.—**And so he layeth up for the righteous sound wisdom.**—So we must translate in accordance with the K'thibh וְצָפַן which is confirmed by the LXX and *Pesch.* as the oldest reading. The K'ri יִצְפֹּן, without the copulative, would connect the proposition of ver. 7 with ver. 6 as essentially synonymous with it, to which construction the meaning is however opposed. [The majority of commentators prefer the K'ri, making this verse a continuation and not a consequence of the preceding. KAMPHAUSEN agrees with our author in what seems to us the more forcible construction, which has the advantage also of resting on the written text; comp. BÖTTCHER, § 929, *b.*—A.]. צָפַן to protect, to preserve, after the manner of a treasure or jewel, over which one watches that it may not be stolen; comp. above, ver 1, and also vii. 1 : x. 14. —In regard to תּוּשִׁיָּה [rendered "sound wisdom" by the E. V. here and in iii. 21 ; viii. 14 ; xviii. 1] properly prosperity and wisdom united, see Introd., § 2, note 3. The word is probably related to יֵשׁ, and denotes first the essential or actual (so *e. g.*, Job v. 12), and then furthermore help, deliverance (Job vi. 13), or wisdom, reflection, as the foundation of all safety ; so here and iii. 21 ; viii. 14 ; xviii. 1 ; Job xi. 6 sq.; Is. xxviii. 29. Comp. UMBREIT and HIRZEL on Job v. 12. HITZIG (on iii. 21) derives the word from the root שָׁוָה, which he says is transposed into וָשָׁה (? ?), and therefore defends as the primary signification of the expression "an even, smooth path," or subjectively "evenness," *i. e.*, of thought, and so "considerateness;" he compares with this מֵישׁוֹר which signifies "plain" as well as "righteousness."—**A shield for them that walk blamelessly.** — The substantive מָגֵן (shield) is most correctly regarded as an appositive to the subject, "Jehovah:" for also in Ps. xxxiii. 20; lxxxiv. 11; lxxxix. 18, Jehovah is in like manner called a shield to His saints. In opposition to the accusative interpretation of מָגֵן [which is adopted by STUART among others], as object of the verb צָפַן (he secureth, or ensureth) we adduce, on the one hand, the meaning of this verb, and on the other the fact that we should expect rather מָגֵן הִיא (as an appositive to תּוּשִׁיָּה). The old translations, as the LXX and Vulgate, furthermore read the word as a participle (מְמַגֵּן or מָגֵן); they translate it by a verb (LXX: ὑπερασπιεῖ τὴν πορείαν αὐτῶν).—הֹלְכֵי תֹם, literally the "walkers of innocence," are the same as "those that walk uprightly," Prov. x. 9 (the הוֹלֵךְ בַּתֹּם) or Ps. lxxxiv. 11 (the הֹלְכִים בְּתָמִים).—**To protect the paths of justice**, *etc.*—The 8th verse gives more specifically the way in which God manifests Himself to the pious as a shield, and the ensurer of their safety. "Paths of justice" are here, by the substitution of the abstract for the concrete expression, paths of the just, and therefore essentially synonymous with the "way of the pious" in the second clause. Comp. chap. xvii. 23.—Ver.

Digitized by Google

9 carries out the import of the parallel ver 5 as the particle אָז repeated from the preceding verse shows.—**Every good path**.—This expression (כָּל־מַעְגַּל־טוֹב) includes the three conceptions given above, justice, righteousness and integrity, and thus sums up the whole enumeration. Therefore, it is attached without a copula; comp. Ps. viii. ver. 9 *b*.

2. Vers. 10–19 form a period which in structure is quite like vers. 1-9; only that the hypothetical protasis is here considerably shorter than in the preceding period, where the conditions of attaining wisdom are more fully given, and with an emphatic climax of the thought. This is connected with the fact that in the former period the Divine origin of wisdom, here, on the contrary, its practical utility for the moral life and conduct of man forms the chief object of delineation. There wisdom is presented predominantly as the foundation and condition of religious and moral rectitude in general,—here specially as a power for the consecration of feeling and conduct, or as a means of preservation against destructive lusts and passions.—**If wisdom entereth into thine heart.**—This "coming into the heart" must be the beginning of all attaining to wisdom; then, however, she who has, as it were, been received as a guest into the heart must become really lovely and dear to the soul. There is, therefore, a climax of the thought, as above in vers. 1-4. The *heart* is here, as always, named as the centre and organic basis of the entire life of the soul, as the seat of desire, and the starting point for all personal self-determination. The *soul*, on the contrary, appears as the aggregate and sum total of all the impulses and efforts of the inner man. The former designates the living centre, the latter the totality of the personal life of man. Comp. BECK, *Bibl. Seelenlehre*, p. 65; DELITZSCH, *Bibl. Psychol.*, pp. 248 sq.; VON RUDLOFF, *Lehre vom Menschen*, pp. 59 sq. What the last mentioned author, pp. 64 sq., remarks in criticism upon DELITZSCH's too intellectual conception of the idea of the heart as the "birthplace of the thoughts," —that every where in the Scriptures it appears to belong more to the life of desire and feeling, than to the intellectual activity of the soul,—this view finds foundation and support especially in the passage now before us, as well as in most of the passages which mention heart and soul together (*e. g.*, Prov. xxiv. 12; Ps. xiii. 2; Jerem. iv. 19; Deut. vi. 5; Matth. xxii. 37; Acts iv. 32). Comp. also HITZIG on this passage.—**And knowledge is pleasant to thy soul**.—[For a peculiarity of grammatical structure in the original, see critical notes.]—Ver. 11. **Then will reflection watch over thee.**—שָׁמַר עַל as in vi. 22. שָׁמַר (construed, however, with a mere accusative of the object) and נָצַר have already been found connected in ver. 8 above, and occur again in chap. iv. 6. מְזִמָּה here reflection, considerateness (LXX: βουλὴ καλή), properly "wisdom, so far forth as its direction is outward, and it presents itself in relation to the uncertain, testing it, and to danger, averting it" (HITZIG).

Ver. 12. **To deliver thee from an evil way** — properly "from the way of evil." — **From the man that uttereth perverseness.**—תַּהְפֻּכוֹת perverseness, a strong abstract form [found almost exclusively in Proverbs—FUERST] which expresses the exact opposite of מֵישָׁרִים ("uprightness," ch. i. 3; ii. 9),—it is therefore deceitfulness, subtlety, maliciousness. Comp the expressions, "mouth of perverseness," chap. viii. 13; x. 32; "tongue of perverseness," x. 31; "man of perverseness," xvi. 28; also passages like vi. 14; xvi. 30; xxiii. 33.—Vers. 13-15. Closer description of the wayward or perversely speaking man, in which, because of the generic comprehensiveness of the conception אִישׁ, the plural takes the place of the singular.—**Who forsake straight paths**.—The participle הָעֹזְבִים expresses, strictly interpreted, a preterite idea, "those who have forsaken;" for according to ver. 15 the evil doers who are described are already to be found in crooked ways. —**In dark ways.**—Comp. Rom. xiii. 12; Eph. v. 11; 1 Thess. v. 5; also Job xxiv. 15; Is. xxix. 15.—**Deceitful wickedness**—literally "perverseness of evil" (comp. remarks on ver. 12) a mode of combining two nouns which serves to strengthen the main idea.—**Whose paths are crooked**—literally, "who in respect to their ways are crooked;" for the prefixed אָרְחֹתֵיהֶם is to be construed as an accusative of relation belonging to the following עִקְּשִׁים; comp. xix. 1; xxviii. 6. In the second clause in the place of this adverbial accusative, there is substituted the more circumstantial but clearer construction with בְּ "perverse *in* their ways."

Vers. 16-19. The representation passes into a warning against being betrayed by vile women, just as in v. 3; vi. 24; vii. 5 sq.—**From the strange woman, from the wanton woman.**—As "strange woman" (אִשָּׁה זָרָה) or a "wanton woman" (נָכְרִיָּה, properly "unknown," and so equivalent to "strange or foreign woman") the betrayer into unchastity is here designated, so far forth as she is the wife of another (comp. vi. 26), who, however, has forsaken her husband (ver. 17), and therein has transgressed also God's commandment, has broken the covenant with her God (ver. 17, l. c.). —The person in question is accordingly at all events conceived of as an Israelitess; and this is opposed to the opinion of those who, under the designation "the strange, or the foreign woman" (especially in connection with the last expression which appears as the designation of the adulteress in chap. v. 20; vi. 24; vii. 5; xxiii. 27), think first of those not belonging to the house of Israel, because the public prostitutes in Israel were formerly, for the most part, of foreign birth (so especially J. F. FRISCH: *Commentatio de muliere peregrina apud Ebræos minus honeste habita*, Leips., 1744, and among recent commentators, *e. g.*, UMBREIT). This view is in conflict with the context of the passage before us quite as decidedly as is the idea of the LXX, which interprets the foreign and wanton woman as the personification of temptation in contrast with wis-

Digitized by Google

dom (i. 20 sq.), but to carry out this view is obliged to introduce all manner of arbitrary relations,—*e. g.*, referring that of the "companion of youth" in ver. 17 to the instruction in Divine truth (διδασκαλία νεότητος), which was a guide in youth. It is decisive against this allegorical conception of the strange woman, which has been a favorite with some Christian expositors also, such as MELANCHTHON, JOACH. LANGE, CHR. B. MICHAELIS, that the wicked and perverse men in vers. 12-15 cannot possibly be interpreted figuratively, but certainly only as individual concrete representatives of moral evil. [This word נָכְרִיָּה is "especially applied to those 'strange women' whom Solomon himself loved in his old age, and who turned away his heart from the Lord his God, and beguiled him to favor and encourage the worship of their false gods (see 1 Kings xi. 1-8; comp. Neh. xiii. 26, 27). Here is a solemn lesson. Solomon warns his son against that very sin of which he himself was afterwards guilty. Thus by God's goodness Solomon's words in this Divinely inspired book were an antidote to the poison of his own vicious example." WORDSWORTH].—**Who maketh her words smooth**—*i. e.*, who knows how to speak flattering and tempting words; comp. vii. 21; Ps. v. 9; Rom. iii. 13.—Ver. 17. **The companion of her youth.**—The same expression occurs also in Jerem. iii. 4; comp. Ps. lv. 13, where אַלּוּף in like manner means companion, confidant. The forsaking of this "companion of youth," *i. e.*, the first lawful husband, is, at the same time, a "forgetting of the covenant of her God," *i. e.*, a forgetting, a wilful disregard of that which she has solemnly vowed to God. Marriage appears here not merely as a covenant entered into in the presence of God, but in a certain sense one formed with God. Quite similar is the representation in Mal ii. 14, where the adulterous Israelite is censured for the faithless abandonment of his אֵשֶׁת נְעוּרִים (wife of youth) because God was witness with her at the formation of the marriage covenant. That the marriages of the Israelites "were not consummated without sacred rites connected with the public religion, although the Pentateuch makes no mention of them," is accordingly a very natural assumption,—one which, *e. g.*, EWALD, BERTHEAU, HITZIG, REINKE, V. GERLACH, *etc.*, have made on the ground of the two passages here under consideration, especially the passage in Malachi. Yet compare besides A. KÖHLER on the latter passage (*Nachexil. Prophh.*, IV. 102 sq.), who finds there a witness of Jehovah, not at the consummation, but at the violation of marriage.—Vers. 18, 19. **For her house sinks down to death**, *etc.*—A reason for the strong expression in ver. 16, "to **deliver** thee from the strange woman."—**And to the dead her paths.**—The רְפָאִים (*i. e.*, properly the weak, languid, powerless [GESEN., *Thes.: quieti, silentes*,—FUERST, "the dark, the shadowy"]; comp. the εἴδωλα καμόντων of HOMER, and the *umbræ* of VIRGIL) are the dwellers in the kingdom of the dead (comp. ix.: xxi. 16; Ps. lxxxviii. 10; Is. xiv. 9: xxvi. 14, 18, 19), and stand here, like the Latin *inferi*, for the world of the dead, or Sheol itself.—**Her visitors all return not again**,—because from Sheol there is no return to the land of the living; see Job vii. 9, 10,—and comp. Prov. v. 5, 6.—**Paths of life**, as in Ps. xvi. 11; Prov. v. 6.

8. Vers. 20-22. While the לְמַעַן [in order that] is strictly dependent on ver. 11, and co-ordinate with the לְ of the two final clauses in vers. 12 sq. and 16 sq., still we are to recognize in the announcement of a purpose which it introduces, a conclusion of the entire admonitory discourse which this chapter contains,—an epilogue, as it were ("all this I say to thee in order that," *etc.*), which again may be resolved into a positive and a negative proposition (vers. 20, 21 and ver. 22). UMBREIT's translation of לְמַעַן by "therefore" is ungrammatical, nor can it be justified by reference to passages like Ps. xxx. 12; li. 4; Hos. viii. 4.—**The upright shall inhabit the land.**—In the description of the highest earthly prosperity as a "dwelling in the land" (*i. e.*, in the native land, not upon the earth in general, which would give a meaning altogether vague and indefinite), we find expressed the love of an Israelite for his fatherland, in its peculiar strength and its sacred religious intensity. "The Israelite was, beyond the power of natural feeling, which makes home dear to every one, more closely bound to the ancestral soil by the whole form of the theocracy; torn from it he was in the inmost roots of life itself strained and broken. Especially from some Psalms belonging to the period of the exile this patriotic feeling is breathed out in the fullest glow and intensity. The same form of expression has also passed over into the New Testament, comp. Matth. v. 5, and also, with regard to the idea as a whole, Ps. xxxvii. 9, 11, 29; Prov. x. 30" (ELSTER).—**But the wicked shall be rooted out from the land.**—See critical notes above.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

He only who seeks after wisdom, *i. e.*, who turns his practical efforts wholly toward it, and walks in its ways, finds true wisdom. For wisdom in the objective sense, is a gift of God, an effluence from Him, the only wise (Rom. xvi. 27). It can therefore come into possession of him alone who seeks appropriately to make his own the true subjective wisdom, which is aspiration after God and divine things; who in thought and experience seeks to enter into communion with God; who devotes himself entirely to God, subjects himself fully to His discipline and guidance, in order that God in turn may be able to give Himself wholly to him, and to open to him the blessed fulness of His nature.—This main thought of our chapter, which comes out with especial clearness in vers. 5, 6, is essentially only another side, and somewhat profounder conception, of the motto which, in i. 7, is prefixed to the entire collection, viz., that the fear of Jehovah is the beginning of wisdom,—or again, of the significant utterance in chap. xxviii. 5: "They that seek God understand all things." Within the limits of the New Testament we may compare above all else, what the Lord, in John vii. 17, presents as the condition of a full comprehen-

Digitized by Google

sion of Himself and of the divine truth revealed in Him: "If any man will do His will he shall know whether this doctrine be of God;" likewise: "Ask and it shall be given you; seek and ye shall find," *etc.* (Matt. vii. 7); and also: "Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light" (Eph. v. 14). Comp. further the passage from the Book of Wisdom (chap. vi. 12, 13), which MELANCHTHON, with perfect propriety, cites in this connection: "Wisdom is willingly found of them that seek her, yea, she cometh to meet and maketh herself known to those that desire her;" and also David's language: "In thy light do we see light" (Ps. xxxvi. 9), the well-known favorite motto of AUGUSTINE, which in like manner, as it was employed by the profound metaphysician MALEBRANCHE, ought to be used by all Christian philosophers as their daily watchword and symbol.

In the second section of this admonition (vers. 10–19) this true wisdom, to be conferred by God, to be found only with God, is more completely exhibited, on the side of its salutary influence upon the moral life of humanity, especially as a preserver against sin and vice and their ruinous consequences. After this in conclusion the epilogue (vers. 20–22) contrasts the blessed results of wise and righteous conduct and the punishment of ungodliness in strongly antithetic terms, which remind us of the close of the first Psalm and of the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. vii. 24-27; comp. Ps. i. 6). Comp. the exegetical comments on these two sections.

HOMILETIC.

Homily on the entire chapter: The main stages in the order of grace, contemplated from the point of view of the wisdom of the Old Testament: 1) The call (vers. 1-4); 2) Enlightenment (vers. 5, 6); 3) Conversion (vers. 7-10); 4) Preservation or sanctification (vers. 11-20); 5) Perfection (vers. 21, 22).—STARKE:—The order of proceeding for the attainment of true wisdom and its appropriate use: 1) the order for the attainment of wisdom consists in this,—that we *a*) ask for it, (1-3), *b*) search for it with care and diligence (4). 2) The wisdom thus attained is the only true wisdom, as appears *a*) from its own characteristics (5), *b*) from the person of its giver (6), *c*) from the conduct of the men who possess it (7, 8). 3) This only true wisdom is profitable, *a*) for the attainment of righteousness in faith and life (9-11, *b*) for deliverance from evil (12-19), *c*) for the steadfast maintenance of an upright life (20-22).—Simpler and better STÖCKER:—*Studiosi sapientiæ* 1) *officium* (1-8); 2) *præmium* (9-22). [The student of wisdom 1) in his duty, 2) in his reward].—*Calwer Handb.:* The way to wisdom consists 1) in listening to its call (1, 2); 2) in searching for it prayerfully (3-6); 3) in deference to that portion of wisdom which one has already attained, by earnestness in a holy walk (7-9); 4) in the experience of the power of wisdom, which lies in this, that it preserves from ways of evil, especially of impurity (10-22).

Vers. 1-9. MELANCHTHON:—"He admonishes how we may make progress (in wisdom): for he combines two causes: 1) God's aid; 2) our own zeal." (No. 2 ought here necessarily to have been put first—an improvement which was made by STÖCKER in his reproduction of this analysis of MELANCHTHON).—STÖCKER:—The rounds upon which one must, with divine help, climb up to the attainment of wisdom are seven: 1) eager hearing; 2) firm retention; 3) attentive meditation; 4) unquestioned progress; 5) due humiliation: 6) devoted invoking of God's help; 7) tireless self-examination.—[CHALMERS (on vers. 1-9):—The righteousness of our conduct contributes to the enlightenment of our creed. The wholesome reaction of the moral on the intellectual is clearly intimated here, inasmuch as it is to the righteous that God imparteth wisdom].—STARKE (on vers. 1-4):—As the children of the world turn their eyes upon silver and treasures, run and race after them, make themselves much disquiet to attain them, though after all they are but shadows and vanity; so ought the children of God to use much more diligence to attain heavenly wisdom, which endures forever, and makes the man who possesses it really prosperous.—[Vers. 1-6. BRIDGES:—Earthly wisdom is gained by study; heavenly wisdom by prayer. Study may form a Biblical scholar; prayer puts the heart under a heavenly pupilage, and therefore forms the wise and spiritual Christian. But prayer must not stand in the stead of diligence. Let it rather give life and energy to it.—ARNOT (vers. 2):—The ear inclined to divine wisdom will draw the heart: the heart drawn will incline the ear. Behold one of the circles in which God, for His own glory, makes His unnumbered worlds go round.—(Ver. 4). Fervent prayer must be tested by persevering pains.—TRAPP (ver. 2):—Surely as waters meet and rest in low valleys, so do God's graces in lowly hearts.—(Ver. 8). A dull suitor begs a denial].—STARKE (On vers. 5-9):—Righteousness of faith and righteousness of life are closely connected. As soon as the first exists (vers. 5-8) the other must also show itself in an earnest and pure walk before God and man, Luke i. 74, 75; Phil. i. 11.—LANGE (on ver. 6):—One may indeed by natural knowledge very readily learn that God is a very benevolent being; but how He becomes to a sinner the God of love, this can be learned only from the mouth of God in the Holy Scriptures.—[TRAPP (ver. 9):—"Thou shalt understand righteousness," not as *cognoscitiva*, standing in speculation, but as *directiva vitæ*, a rule of life.]

Vers. 10–22.—[Ver. 11. BRIDGES:—Before wisdom was the object of our search. Now, having found it, it is our pleasure. Until it is so it can have no practical influence.—ARNOT:—It is pleasure that can compete with pleasure; it is "joy and peace in believing" that can overcome the pleasure of sin.]—STÖCKER (on vers. 10-12):—Wisdom helps such as love her in all good, and preserves them against all evil; she directs them to the good and turns them from the evil way.—(On vers. 12-19):—Wisdom delivers from the three snares of the devil, viz., 1) from a godless life; 2) from false doctrine; 3) from impurity and licentiousness.—STARKE (on vers. 12 sq.):—Daily experience teaches us that we are by nature in a condition from which we need deliverance. But how few are there of

Digitized by Google

those who are willing to be delivered, Matt. xxiii. 37!—(On vers. 20-22):—Not merely some steps in the right way, but continuing to the end brings blessedness, Matt. xxiv. 13!—Granted that for a time it goes ill with the godly in this world. God's word must nevertheless be made good, if not here, surely in eternity, Ps. cxxvi. 5.—[BRIDGES:—The spell of lust palsies the grasp by which its victim might have *taken hold of the paths of life* for his deliverance.]—HASIUS (on vers. 21, 22):—People who mean rightly neither with God nor men are with their posterity rooted out of the world. He who observes will even now see plain proofs of this, Ps. lxxiii. 19; xxxiv. 16.—VON GERLACH (on ver. 21:)—The meaning of the promise, so common in the law, of "the pious dwelling in the land" depends especially on the fact that Canaan was type and pledge of the eternal inheritance of the saints in light.

---

4. Continuation of the exhibition of the salutary results of a devout and pious life.

CHAP. III. 1–18.

1 My son, forget not my doctrine,
and let thy heart keep my commandments;
2 for length of days and years of life
and welfare will they bring to thee.
3 Let not love and truth forsake thee;
bind them about thy neck,
write them upon the tablet of thy heart;
4 so wilt thou find favor and good reputation
in the eyes of God and of men.
5 Trust in Jehovah with all thy heart,
and rely not on thine own understanding.
6 In all thy ways acknowledge him,
and he will make smooth thy paths.
7 Be not wise in thine own eyes;
fear Jehovah and depart from evil.
8 Healing will then come to thy body
and refreshing to thy bones.
9 Honor Jehovah with thy wealth,
and with the best of all thine income;
10 so will thy barns be filled with plenty
and with new wine will thy vats overflow.
11 Jehovah's correction, my son, despise not,
neither loathe thou his chastening;
12 for whom Jehovah loveth, him he chasteneth
and holdeth him dear, as a father his son.
13 Blessed is the man that hath found wisdom,
and he that attaineth understanding;
14 for better is its accumulation than the accumulation of silver,
and her gain (is better) than the finest gold.
15 More precious is she than pearls,
and all thy jewels do not equal her.
16 Long life is in her right hand,
in her left hand riches and honor.
17 Her ways are ways of pleasantness,
and all her paths (are paths) of peace.
18 A tree of life is she to those that lay hold upon her,
and he who holdeth her fast is blessed.

Digitized by Google

5 Description of the powerful protection which God, the wise Creator of the world, ensures to the pious.

Chap. III. 19–26.

19 Jehovah hath with wisdom founded the earth,
the heavens (hath he) established by understanding;
20 by his knowledge were the floods divided,
and the clouds dropped down dew.
21 My son, never suffer to depart from thine eyes,
maintain (rather) thoughtfulness and circumspection;
22 so will they be life to thy soul
and grace to thy neck.
23 Then wilt thou go thy way in safety
and thy foot will not stumble.
24 When thou liest down thou wilt not be afraid,
and when thou liest down thy sleep is sweet.
25 Thou needst not fear from sudden alarm,
nor from the destruction of the wicked when it cometh.
26 For Jehovah will be thy confidence
and keep thy foot from the snare.

6. Admonition to benevolence and justice.

Chap. III. 27–35.

27 Refuse not good to him to whom it is due,
when thine hands have power to do it.
28 Say not to thy neighbor: "Go and come again;"
or "to-morrow I will give it"—while yet thou hast it.
29 Devise not evil against thy neighbor
while he dwelleth securely by thee.
30 Contend with no man without cause,
when he did thee no evil.
31 Imitate not the man of violence
and choose none of his ways.
32 For an abhorrence to Jehovah is the deceiver,
but with the upright he maintaineth true friendship.
33 Jehovah's curse dwelleth in the house of the wicked
but the home of the just he blesseth.
34 If he scorneth the scorners,
to the lowly he giveth grace.
35 Honor shall the wise inherit,
but shame sweepeth fools away.

GRAMMATICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 6.—[The idea of the verb יְיַשֵּׁר is not that of guidance [E. V.: "shall direct thy paths"], but that of making straight (Stuart), or, perhaps, better still, making smooth (Fuerst, De W., Kamph.).—A.]

Vers. 7, 8.—[אַל־תְּהִי. the "dehortative" use of the Jussive, Bött., § 964, 8; while in ver. 8 we have an example of the "desponsive" use—*it shall be.*—לְשָׁרֶּךָ. For the doubling of the ר by Dagesh see Bött., § 392 *c.* He explains it as "mimetic for greater vigor." Some texts carry this even into the succeeding ךָּ, § 885, A. Fuerst (Lex., *sub verbo*) pronounces it unnecessary to change the vocalization as proposed by some commentators and preferred by Zöckler, and agrees with Umbreit in his view of the meaning.—A.]

Ver. 12.—In the ordinary rendering, "even as a father the son in whom he delighteth." or "whom he holds dear" [which is the rendering, *e. g.*, of the E. V., De Wette, Stuart, Noyes, Muensch.], יִרְצֶה is construed as in a relative clause. But then we should expect rather the perfect רָצָה; and there should have been in the first clause a comparative proposition of like construction with the one before us. The LXX, from which Heb. xii. 5 is literally quoted [a rendering which Holden adopts and defends], appears to have read יַכְאִב instead of וּכְאָב, for it translates the second clause by μαστιγοῖ δὲ πάντα υἱὸν ὃν παραδέχεται [scourgeth every son whom he receiveth]. This old variation, however, appears to owe its origin to the endeavor to secure a better parallelism. [Kamph. adopts a slightly different rendering, which makes the lat-

Digitized by Google

ter part of the clause relative, but makes the relative the subject and not the object of the verb, thus obviating the objection in regard to tense; *and* (dealeth) *as a father* (who) *wisheth well to his son.* The אֶת for אֵת at the beginning of the verse is explained by Bött., § 362, 3, as the result of assimilation to the subsequent אֶת.—A.]

Ver. 18.—In the Hebrew וְתֹמְכֶיהָ מְאֻשָּׁר the plural תֹּמְכִים is employed distributively, or, as it were, of undefined individuals, for which reason its predicate stands in the singular; comp. Gen. xlvii. 3; Num. xxiv. 9; Gesen., *Lehrgeb.*, p. 713; Ewald, § 309, *a* [Bött., § 702, 8].

Ver. 26.—The בְּ in בְּכִסְלֶךָ is the so-called בְּ *essentiæ*, which serves for the emphatic and strengthened introduction of the predicate, as, *e. g.*, in בְּעֶזְרִי, Ex. xviii. 4 (Gesen., *Lehrgeb.*, 839, Ewald, *Lehrb.*, 217 f.).

Ver. 27.—"When thy hands have power to do it;" literally "when thy hands are for God." With this phrase compare יֶשׁ לְאֵל יָד, Gen. xxxi. 29, Micah ii. 1; or אֵין לְאֵל יָד, Deut. xxviii. 32; Neh. v. 5. [The weight, both of lexicographical and exegetical authority, is, and, we think, plainly should be, against this view of the author. See, *e. g.*, Gesen. and Fuerst; אֵל has assigned to it distinctly the signification "strength," the abstract quality corresponding to the concrete, "the strong," *i. e.*, God. It belongs to the power—it is in the power]. Inasmuch as in these idioms the singular יָד always occurs, the K'ri reads in our passage also יָדְךָ, and the LXX for the same reason had translated ἡ χείρ σου [the translation being a free one; Frankel, *Vorstudien zur Septuaginta*, p. 239]. Yet there is no grammatical reason whatever for the change.

Ver. 28.—[לְרֵעֶיךָ, K'thibh, another distributive plural, where the K'ri has a singular; see Bött., §§ 702, *d*—886, *c*. —A.]

Ver. 30.—[Holden translates the last clause "surely he will return thee evil," because the ordinary rendering "gives to the word גָּמַל the sense of doing or performing, which it seems never to bear, but always that of *returning, requiting, recompensing*." The primary import, however, seems to be to *collect*, to *complete*, which fact, together with the tense, justifies the almost entire unanimity which sustains the ordinary rendering.—A.]

EXEGETICAL.

1. The close connection between this group of admonitions and chap. ii. appears at once externally in the resuming of the address "My son" (ii. 1), which recurs three times in chap iii., vers. 1, 11, 21,—without, however, for that reason, introducing in each instance a new paragraph; for in ver. 11 at least the series of admonitions beginning in ver. 1 continues in its former tone without interruption (comp. especially ver. 9),—and again the new commencement in ver. 21 does not equal in importance that in ver. 19 sq., or that in ver. 27 sq.—Hitzig maintains that vers. 22-26 are spurious, inasmuch as the promise of reward which it contains, after the earlier briefer suggestions of virtue's reward in vers. 4, 6, 8, 10, seems tedious and disturbing; inasmuch as their style of expression appears tame, prosaic, and even, in some degree, clumsy; inasmuch as there may be detected in them traces of a strange and later idiom (*e. g.*, the חַיִּים וְחֵן [life and grace] in ver. 22; the שֹׁאָה [destruction] in ver. 25; the מִלָּכֶד [from the snare] in ver. 26); and finally—the thing which appears in fact to have given the chief impulse to his suspicion—inasmuch as from the omission of these five verses there would result another instance of the decimal grouping of verses before we come again to the address to the "children" of wisdom in chap. iv. 1, just as before the בְּנִי [my son] in vers. 11 and 21 was repeated in each case after ten verses. But since no kind of external testimony can be adduced in support of this assumption of an interpolation, while, on the other hand, a version as old as the LXX contains the verses entire, the suspicion appears to rest on grounds wholly subjective, and to be supported by reasonings that are only specious. This is especially true of the fact that there are in each instance ten verses between the first addresses, "my son,"—which loses all its significance when we observe that in chap. i. the same address recurs at much shorter intervals,—that between the "my son" in chap. ii. 1 and the first in the third chapter there are no less than 22 verses,—and that finally the paragraphs or "strophes" formed by the repetition of this address in the two following chapters (iv. 10 sq.; iv. 20 sq.; v. 1 sq.) are by no means of equal length, and can be brought into uniformity only by critical violence (the rejection of chap. iv. 16, 17 and 27).—If we therefore cannot justify Hitzig's endeavor to produce by the exclusion of several verses a symmetrical external structure for our chapter, *i. e.*, a division of it into three equal strophes, we are also obliged to differ with him when he conceives of the contents as mainly admonitory, in contrast with the more descriptive character of chap. ii. For here as there we find admonitions, direct or indirect, to the securing and retaining of wisdom (vers. 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 21, 27 sq.) alternating with delineations of the blessedness which becomes the portion of its possessors (vers. 4, 6 b, 8, 10, 22 sq., 32 sq.), or with praises of wisdom itself (vers. 13 sq., 19 sq.). Especially are the commencement and conclusion of the chapter in close correspondence with those of chap. ii., and accordingly justify our conception of the general import of the proverbial discourses which it contains, as being a sort of continuation of the longer discourse which constitutes the preceding chapter. Only in two points do we find essentially new material introduced into the representation, which is now mainly admonitory and again chiefly descriptive,—*viz.*, in vers. 19 sq., where the protecting and preserving power of wisdom is illustrated by a reference to God's creative wisdom as the original source and model of all human wisdom,—and in vers. 27 sq., where in the place of the previous admonitions of a more general nature there appears a special admonition to love of one's neighbor, as the sum and crown of all virtues. Therefore (with Delitzsch, comp. above, Introd., § 15) at each of these points we begin a new section.

2. *Continued representation of the salutary consequences of a wise and devout life.* Vers. 1-18.

Digitized by Google

Vers. 1, 2. **Forget not my teaching.**—The substance of this teaching (תּוֹרָה, as in i. 8), or the enumeration of the individual commands (מִצְוֹת) of which it consists, begins with ver. 3.—**Length of days**, properly "extension of days" (אֹרֶךְ יָמִים) as in Ps. xxi. 4), is a description of earthly prosperity as it is promised to wisdom for a reward. Comp. Ex. xx. 12; 1 Kings iii. 14. For that this long life is a happy one, a "living in the promised land" (Deut. iv. 40; v. 30; vi. 2; xi. 9; xxii. 7; xxx. 16), an "abiding in the house of the Lord" and under His blessing (Ps. xv. 1; xxiii. 6; xxvii. 3),—this is plainly assumed. Comp. the parallel expression שָׁלוֹם [peace] in the second member, which here, as below in ver. 17, describes the safety which belongs only to the pious, the religious peace of mind of which the ungodly know nothing (Is. xlviii. 22; lvii. 21).—Vers. 3, 4. The first of the commandments announced in ver. 1, with the corresponding promise of reward.—**Love and truth.**—These ideas חֶסֶד וֶאֱמֶת which are very often associated, in our Book, *e. g.*, in xiv. 22; xvi. 6; xx. 28,—are, when predicated of man, the designation of those attributes in which the normal perfection of his moral conduct towards his neighbor expresses itself. חֶסֶד, which, as a Divine attribute, is equivalent to mercy or grace, designates "the disposition of loving sympathy with others, which rests upon the feeling of brotherhood, the feeling that all men are of like nature, creatures of the same God." This feeling, which is the prime factor in our moral life by which society is constituted, has for its natural basis the destitution and defencelessness of isolated man; from which springs the deeper necessity not only to augment power by mutual outward help, but also by the interchange of thoughts and emotions to effect a richer development of spiritual life, and to discern what in one's own feeling is purely individual, and what is common and eternal" (Elster). אֱמֶת then designates inward truthfulness, the *pectus rectum*, the very essence of a true man opposed to all hypocrisy and dissimulation, the endeavor to mould every form into the closest possible correspondence with the nature of the thing, on which depends all the reliableness and security of life's relations" (Elster, comp. Umbreit). The proofs of a life regulated by "love" and "truth," and so of conduct toward one's neighbor, as loving as it is true, a genuine ἀληθεύειν ἐν ἀγάπῃ [truth in love, Eph. iv. 15] are suggested in the following admonitory discourse in vers. 27 sq.—**Bind them about thy neck**—not as talismans and amulets, as Umbreit suggests, but simply as costly ornaments, which one wears upon the neck (comp. i. 9; also vii. 3); or again as treasures which one will secure against loss, and therefore (if valued like a signet ring, Gen. xxxviii. 18; Jer. xxii. 24) wears attached to a chain about the neck. The latter explanation, to which Hitzig gives the preference, seems to be favored especially by chap. vi. 21, and also by the analogy of the parallel expression "write upon the tablet of the heart," *i. e.*, thoroughly impress upon one's self and appropriate the virtues in question (love and truth—not perchance the "commandments" mentioned in ver. 1, of which C. B. Michaelis and others here think without any good reason); comp. Jer. xxxi. 33; 2 Cor. iii. 3 ["To bind God's law about the neck is not only to *do* it, but to *rejoice* in doing it; to put it on, and to exult in it as the fairest ornament." Wordsw.].—**So wilt thou find favor and good reputation**—literally, "and so find," *etc.* (וּמְצָא); the Imper. with ו *consec.* stands for an Imperf. (Ewald, *Lehrb.*, 235); for "by the command the certainty that obedience will follow is promoted," Hitzig. Comp. iv. 4; xx. 13; Gen. xlii. 8; Isa. viii. 9; xlv. 22. [Bött. calls this the "desponsive" imperative; see § 957, 6—A.].—"Find favor or grace" (מָצָא חֵן) as in Jer. xxxi. 2; 1 Sam. ii. 26; Luke ii. 52; only that in these passages, instead of "in the eyes of God" (*i. e.*, according to God's judgment, comp. Gen. x. 9; 2 Chron. xxx. 22) the simpler phrase "with God" (אֵת, παρά) is combined with the formula under discussion.—**Good reputation.**—Thus we translate, as Hitzig does, the expression שֵׂכֶל טוֹב, which below in chap. xiii. 15, as in Ps. cxi. 10, conveys the idea of good understanding or sagacity [so the E. V., Bertheau, Kamph. render it in this passage also]; but here, as in 2 Chron. xxx. 20, denotes the judgment awarded to any one, the favorable view or opinion held concerning any one. [Fuerst, Van Ess, *etc.*, prefer this rendering, while Gesen., De W., Stuart, Noyes, Muenscher translate "good success."—A.]. With this interpretation the "finding favor" will have reference more to God, the "finding good opinion or favorable judgment" predominantly to men. [Kamph., however, insists that the idea is indivisible—universal favor.]

Vers. 5, 6. **Trust in Jehovah with all thine heart,** *etc.*: the fundamental principle of all religion, consisting in an entire self-commitment to the grace and truth of God, with the abandonment of every attempt to attain blessedness by one's own strength or wisdom; comp. Ps. xxxvii. 3 sq.; cxviii. 8, 9; Jer. ix. 22.—**Regard him.** דָעֵהוּ, strictly "take notice of him," *i. e.*, recognize Him as the unconditional controller over all thy willing and doing. Comp. the opposite: 1 Sam. ii. 12, and in general for this pregnant use of the verb יָדַע Ps. i. 6; xxxvii. 18; Am. iii. 2, *etc.*—Vers. 7, 8. **Fear Jehovah and depart from evil** (comp. xiv. 16; xvi. 6; Job i. 1; xxviii. 28); an absolute contrast to the first clause of the verse; for he who fears God distrusts his own wisdom, when this perchance presents evil and wayward action as something agreeable and desirable (Gen. iii. 5).—**Healing will then be** (come) **to thy body.** Thus probably is the phrase רִפְאוּת תְּהִי to be explained, with Bertheau and Hitzig,—for to express the idea "healing is this to thy body," (Umbreit, Ewald, Elster, and most of the elder commentators) רִפְאוּת הִיא would rather have been required.—Instead of לְשָׁרֶּךָ **thy navel** (which, according to Umbreit, here, unlike Ezek. xvi. 4; Song of Sol. vii. 3, is intended to be a designation of the whole body by a part of special physiological importance) it will pro-

Digitized by Google

bably be correct to read לְשֵׁרְךָ as a contraction of לִשְׁאֵרְךָ, or לִבְשָׂרְךָ as in chap. iv. 22. For translations as early as the LXX and Peshito express simply the idea "to thy body," to which furthermore the parallel "to thy bones" corresponds better (comp xiv. 30; Micah iii. 2) than to the very far-fetched expression "to thy navel."—**Refreshing to thy bones.** שִׁקּוּי strictly irrigation, watering, then refreshing, invigoration; here in contrast with the "languishing of the bones" (Ps. xxxii. 3, 4), *i. e.*, their drying up under a fever heat or an inward anguish of soul, *e. g.*, the pangs of a troubled conscience. Comp. Job xxi. 24; Is. lviii. 11.

Vers. 9, 10. **Honor Jehovah with thy riches.** The מִן in מֵהוֹנֶךָ and the following phrase מֵרֵאשִׁית כָּל־תְּבוּאָתֶךָ is certainly not to be construed as partitive, as though God was to be honored with a part only of one's wealth and of the first fruits of one's increase (so *e. g.*, BERTHEAU), but the preposition מִן here expresses the idea of a coming forth out of something, as in Ps. xxviii. 7; 2 Kings vi. 27. In opposition to the comparative idea which EWALD endeavors to bring out from the מִן ("more than thy wealth") see HITZIG on this passage. With regard to the idea itself compare passages like Ex. xxiii. 19; Deut. xviii. 4 sq.; xxviii. 8 sq.; Mal. iii. 10-12. That the offering in sacrifice the first fruits of the field and of the other revenues of one's possessions or labors was not only enjoined by their law upon the people of God under the Old Testament, but that it was also practiced by other ancient nations as a usage connected with religious worship, appears from passages in classical authors, *e. g.*, DIOD. SICUL., I., 14: PLUT. *de Iside*, p. 377; PLINY'S *Hist. Nat.*, 18, 2. Comp. in general SPENCER, *De legibus Hebræorum ritualibus*, p. 718, sq. ("*de primitiarum origine*"). [Be not content with lip-service, but obey God's law by making the prescribed oblation and by bringing also free-will offerings to Him."—WORDSW. Our author's notes, in their distinct recognition of the first fruits as required for and by Jehovah, are to be preferred to his version, which has the more general but less Jewish idea that "the best" should be given.—A.]—**With new wine will thy vats overflow.** יִפְרֹצוּ, literally: they will extend themselves, separate, swell up Comp. the use of the same verb פָּרַץ with reference to rapidly increasing flocks; Gen. xxx. 20; Job i. 10.—Similar strong metaphors for the description of a rich abundance and the blessing of the harvest may be found, *e. g.*, Joel iv. 18; Amos ix. 13; Lev. xxvi. 5.

Vers. 11, 12. **Jehovah's correction despise thou not.** To the "despising" (מָאַס here as in the quite similar passage Job v. 17 [from which WORDSW. thinks our passage to be derived]), the "loathing" or "abhorring" (קוּץ) is evidently the climax. [In the E. V. generally this distinction between the two verbs is very fairly made; the prevailing rendering of the former being "despise, disdain, reject, refuse," while that of the latter is "loathe, abhor." In the present instance the rendering might easily be taken as an anti-climax —A.].—**And holds him dear as a father his son.** For the general idea that God's corrections are essentially nothing but revelations of His educating love and fatherly faithfulness, comp. in the Old Testament especially Deut. viii. 5; Ps. cxviii. 18; Lam. iii. 33 sq.

Vers. 13-18. Enthusiastic praise of true wisdom, which is one with the fear of God.—**Blessed is the man that hath found wisdom.** The perfect מָצָא, **who hath found,** expresses the idea of permanent possession; the parallel imperfect יָפִיק (from פּוּק, *procedere;* therefore, to bring forth, to bring to view, to bring to pass, comp. viii. 35; xii. 2; xviii. 22) denotes a continually renewed and repeated attaining. The ἐκβάλλειν ("bring forth") used of the scribe "instructed unto the kingdom of heaven," Matt. xiii. 52. cannot be compared directly with our expression, since הֵפִיק clearly contains an idea synonymous and not one contrasted with מָצָא.—**Better is her accumulation than the accumulation of silver.** סַחְרָהּ does not, like the corresponding term פְּרִי in the parallel passage, viii. 19, denote what wisdom brings by way of gain, but the very act of gaining and acquiring (ἐμπορεύεσθαι, LXX). So with תְּבוּאָתָהּ, that which comes with and in herself, the gain which exists in herself. [The "merchandise" of the E. V. is unfortunately obscure and misleading].—**Than the finest gold.** חָרוּץ signifies, according to most of the old interpreters, the finest and purest gold (Vulg.: *aurum primum*). The etymology leads, in the unmistakable identity of the root חרץ with that of the Greek χρυσός, at first only to the idea of clear or bright shining, gleaming or glittering (*coruscare*). Gold is therefore, on the ground of its brilliancy, named in the climax as a more precious possession than silver, to which in ver. 15 the "**pearls**" (instead of the K'thibh פניים we shall be constrained to give an unqualified preference to the K'ri פְּנִינִים, comp. viii. 11; xx. 15: xxxi. 10, *etc.*) supply the culmination in the series, and the generalizing term "all thy jewels" includes the three specified items with all similar articles of value. Comp. viii. 11; Job xxviii. 18, where our verse recurs almost literally. In the latter passage (Job xxviii. 15-19) besides silver, gold and pearls, various other gems, *e. g.*, onyx, sapphire, coral, amber, topaz, *etc.*, are mentioned as falling far below the value of wisdom. In the LXX there appear both in ver. 15 and in 16 amplifying additions, in respect to which HITZIG, while not regarding as original the double clause interpolated in ver. 15 between the two members: οὐκ ἀντιτάσσεται αὐτῇ οὐδὲν πονηρόν. Εὔγνωστός ἐστιν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐγγίζουσιν αὐτῇ [no evil thing competes with her. She is well known to all those that approach her], yet considers it as resting upon an interpolation that had already made its way into the Hebrew text. The supplement added to ver. 16: ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτῆς ἐκπορεύεται δικαιοσύνη, νόμον δὲ καὶ ἔλεον ἐπὶ γλώσσης φορεῖ [from her mouth

Digitized by Google

proceedeth righteousness, law and mercy doth she bear upon her tongue] HEIDENHEIM regards as the gloss of an Alexandrian Jew, who designed with it to oppose certain Pharisaic interpretations (?).—**Long life is in her right hand**, *etc.* • Wisdom here appears personified, endowed with a human body and members,—and in ver. 16 at first in a general way, in ver. 17 so that she is represented as walking, in ver. 18 so that she appears standing like a tree, that dispenses shade and precious fruits. בִּימִינָהּ and בִּשְׂמֹאולָהּ in ver. 16 are at any rate not to be translated "*at* her right hand," and "*at* her left hand" (so LUTHER and many old interpreters, conforming to Ps. xvi. 8; xlv. 9; cx. 5), but "*in* her right and left hand," in accordance with Ps. xvi. 11; Is. xliv. 20, where the preposition בְּ expresses the same idea.—"**Long life**," literally, "**length of days**," as above, in ver. 2, from which passage the LXX has here repeated also the phrase "καὶ ἔτη ζωῆς."—**Riches and honor**, as in viii. 18; xxii. 4. "The blessings which wisdom offers are appropriately distributed between the hands, according to their essential difference. The right hand is regarded as the nearer; and that one live is the foundation for his becoming rich and honored, as health is a condition preliminary to the enjoyment of prosperity. Compare accordingly the arrangement in 1 Kings iii. 11-14" (HITZIG). [An over-fanciful elaboration of the simple idea of the passage.—A.].—**All her paths are** (paths of) **peace**. שָׁלוֹם can be regarded as a genitive, in which case the construction is the same as in Ps. xlv. 6 (according to the interpretation which is probably correct), Ps. xxx. 7; Lev. vi. 8, *etc.*; comp. GESENIUS, *Gramm.* § 121, 6; NAEGELSBACH, § 64, g.;—or as a nominative, "her paths are peace," *i. e.*, peaceable, peaceful, instead of strife and alarm offering pure peace and joy (so nearly all recent commentators, with the exception of UMBREIT and ELSTER, who seem with good reason to prefer the former view). **A tree of life** wisdom is called in ver. 18, as in chap. xi. 30 the "fruit of the righteous" is described by the same figurative expression, in xiii. 12 the fulfilment of an ardent desire, and finally, xv. 4, "temperateness of the tongue." The expression doubtless contains an allusion to the tree of life mentioned by Moses in Gen. ii. 9; iii. 22, although there the definite article stands before חַיִּים, because it was intended to designate the particular tree bearing this name in Paradise. The עֵץ הַחַיִּים of Genesis and the עֵץ חַיִּים of Proverbs are therefore related to each other as the familiar ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου of the Gospels to the υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου without the article in John v. 27. ELSTER, without reason, attempts to deny altogether the reference to Gen. ii. 9, and to make the expression parallel with other figurative representations, like "fountain of life," *etc.* In his observation that the figure of the tree in this passage is based upon the previous personification of wisdom, and that Sol. Song, vii. 9 is therefore to be compared, HITZIG is certainly right (comp. also passages like Is. lxi. 3; Jer. xvii. 8; Ps. i. 3; xcii. 12). We must, however, regard as less pertinent the other proposition of the same commentator, according to which the tree of life in our passage corresponds not only with the tree of the same name in Paradise, but at the same time also with the tree of knowledge (Gen. iii. 3), and so exhibits the identity of the two trees of Paradise. For as a thoroughly practical demeanor, consisting in the fear of God and obedience (see i. 7) the true wisdom of the Book of Proverbs unquestionably presents as complete a contrast to all assuming and "devilish" wisdom from beneath (James iii. 15) as the tree of life in Paradise to that of knowledge.—**And he who holds her fast is blessed**. See critical notes. See also below, notes on chap. xv. 22.

3. *Description of the wisdom of God that created the world, as the mighty protector of him that fears God:* vers. 19-26.—**Jehovah hath with wisdom founded the earth**, *etc.* A connection undoubtedly exists between this allusion to the divine archetype of all human wisdom and what has been before said, so far forth as the paradisiacal tree of life of primitive time seems to have called to the mind of the author the creation of the world, and therefore afforded him occasion for the brief delineation of the creative wisdom of God that lies before us, of which the passage, chap. viii. 22 sq., is only a fuller development (comp. also Job xxviii. 12 sq.; Ecclesiast. xxiv. 2 sq.). Yet if the connection were really as close as it is commonly regarded (*e. g.*, by BERTHEAU, who finds in vers. 19, 20 the conclusion of the series of thoughts beginning in ver. 11; by ELSTER, who discerns here "in a certain sense a metaphysical confirmation of the foregoing:" and in general also by HITZIG, *etc.*), the demonstrative conjunction כִּי (for) would unquestionably stand at the beginning of the 19th verse; this, however, is wanting both in the original text and in the older versions, and was first introduced by LUTHER. Therefore as the words stand, with an emphatic prefixing of the subject "Jehovah" (as at the commencement of many Psalms, *e. g.*, Ps. xxvii.; xcvii.; xcix., *etc.*), they are evidently designed not so much to serve as a continuation of representations already begun, as for the introduction of ideas essentially new,—and these new thoughts are the promises contained in vers. 21-26, of the divine protection and blessing, of which the wise man, *i. e.*, he who acts and walks in accordance with this divine wisdom, will infallibly have the full enjoyment. Furthermore, comp., with reference to the idea of the conformity of the practical, ethical wisdom of man with the absolute creative wisdom of God, the "Doctrinal and Ethical" notes.—**With wisdom**. בְּחָכְמָה, literally "through" wisdom, *i. e.*, not merely with the manifestation of wisdom as an attribute of His, but by means of the personal, essential wisdom, as an independent, creative power indwelling in Him from eternity, comp. viii. 22 sq. In the same hypostatic sense, therefore, are also the interchangeable ideas of "understanding" תְּבוּנָה ver. 19 l. c., and "knowledge" דַּעַת in ver. 20, to be understood. [With this view of the author BERTHEAU agrees, so TRAPP and some others of the old English expositors: SCOTT, HOLDEN

suggest it as possible; while STUART, MUENSCHER and others, judging more correctly, we think, find here none of those personal attributes which are so conspicuous in chap. viii. and there so clearly shape the interpretation —A.]. On ver. 19 comp. in addition Jer. x. 12, and on ver. 20, Gen. i. 6 sq.; ii. 6.—**Did the seas divide.** The perf. נִבְקָעוּ, "they have divided," refers to the primary creative act of the division once for all of the masses of water above and beneath the firmament, Gen. i. 6 sq., while the imperf., יִרְעֲפוּ, relates to the constantly repeated and still continued emptying of the clouds in rain, as a consequence of that sundering of the waters which belongs to the history of creation. [The E. V. loses this distinction and refers both to the present, "are"].

Vers. 21, 22. **My son, never suffer to depart from thine eyes**, *etc.* אַל־יָלֻזוּ (for which, perhaps, in conformity with iv. 21 we ought to read יַלִּזוּ) signifies literally, "there must not escape, slip aside" (from לוּז) *deflexit, a via declinavit*). As subjects for the plural verb we usually find supplied from the preceding, especially from ver. 1 sq., the idea "my doctrines, my commands," [as in the E. V. and the commentaries of STUART, MUENSCHER and others]. But this is plainly quite too far-fetched. It is simpler, with UMBREIT, HITZIG, *etc.*, to conceive of the following hemistich, "thoughtfulness and circumspection," as at the same time subjects of the verb in the first, and to explain their omission in the former clause to which they should properly have been attached, on the ground of the peculiar vivacity of the representation. This liveliness of expression can in some measure be preserved in our version by a "rather" after the verb of the second clause.—**Maintain thoughtfulness and circumspection.** The more uncommon תֻּשִׁיָּה (comp. above ii. 7) stands here instead of חָכְמָה (wisdom) ver. 19, and also the less frequent מְזִמָּה instead of תְּבוּנָה which occurs there, in order to suggest the difference between the absolute wisdom and insight of God and the corresponding attributes of man. The LXX instead of the present order appear to have found the reverse, as they translate βουλὴν καὶ ἔννοιαν. Comp. HEIDENHEIM (as above cited).—**So will they be life to thy soul,** *etc.* In reply to HITZIG's disparagement of the genuineness of vers. 22-26, see remarks above, at the commencement of the exegesis. With respect to the thought of ver. 22 f. c., comp. above vers. 2, 16, 18; also iv. 22; viii. 35, *etc.* For last clause comp. i. 9; iii. 8.

Ver. 23. **Then wilt thou go thy way in safety.** לָבֶטַח, in security, free from care, full of trust and good confidence, as below in ver. 29. ["Thou shalt ever go under a double guard, the 'peace of God' within thee (Phil. iv. 7) and the 'power of God' without thee, (1 Pet. i. 5)."—TRAPP.—For illustrations drawn from travellers' experience near Jerusalem, see THOMSON'S *Land and Book*, I., 109.—A]. The simple בֶּטַח is used in the same way in chap. x. 9. For ver. 28 l. c. compare Ps. xci. 12, for the whole verse Prov. iv. 12.—Ver. 24. **When thou liest down.** The imperf. תִּשְׁכַּב in the first member probably designs to express the idea of "laying one's self down to rest," while the following perf. וְשָׁכַבְתָּ would designate the effect and consequence of this act, the reclining and sleeping. Thus most interpreters have correctly judged. HITZIG amends according to the LXX: אִם תֵּשֵׁב, if thou sittest, which is plainly needlessly arbitrary. For the thought comp. furthermore chap. vi. 22; Deut. xxviii. 66.—Ver. 25. **Thou needest not fear from sudden alarm.** אַל־תִּירָא literally **fear thou not.** Since however the אָז in ver. 23 still has its effect, the expression is not to be taken merely as an admonition, but at the same time as a description of the future condition (EWALD, *Lehrbuch* 310, a). [BÖTT. § 964, a, classes it with the "permissive negatives"].—**Nor from the destruction of the wicked.** שֹׁאַת רְשָׁעִים the old commentators unanimously regard as active; the onset of the wicked, the storm which they raise against the pious (*procella quam impii excitant*, CHR. B. MICHAELIS). So recently HITZIG, while nearly all other modern interpreters since DÖDERLEIN prefer the passive conception; the storm or destruction that will sweep away the wicked. A positive decision is probably not possible. Yet the parallel in Ps. xxxv. 8, seems to favor the latter view [which is adopted also by STUART and MUENSCHER]. With reference to the subject compare further, for clause *a*, Ps. xci. 5; Prov. i. 27; xxiv. 22; and for *b*, Job v. 21.—Ver. 26. **For Jehovah will be thy confidence**: literally, will be in thy confidence. כֶּסֶל is here unquestionably trust, confidence, as in Job viii. 14; xxxi. 24; Ps. lxxviii. 7. The signification "loins, side," which the Vulgate has given to the expression ("*Dominus erit in latere tuo*") and, in imitation of this, *e. g.*, ZIEGLER, MUENTINGHE, *etc.*, agrees indeed with passages like Job xv. 27; Lev. iii. 4, 10; xv. 4, *etc.*, but not with the one before us.—**And keep thy foot from the snare.** The substantive לֶכֶד, snare—for which more usually מוֹקֵשׁ or פַּח —occurs only here, is not, however, for that reason necessarily to be regarded, as HITZIG would have it, as a sign of a later phraseology.

4. *Admonition to benevolence and justice:* Vers. 27-35. A connection of this exhortation with some more specific point in the foregoing (with ver. 21 or ver. 20, *e. g.*, as HITZIG suggests, assuming vers. 22-26 to be spurious) need not be attempted, since the whole of this brief section definitely enough distinguishes itself from the longer series of proverbial discourses, as an independent and peculiar whole.—**Refuse not good to him that deserves it**: literally, "hold not good back from its master," *i. e.*, from him to whom it belongs ["either by the law of equity or of charity," TRAPP,—"whether upon their deserving or upon their need," BP. HALL], him who is at the same time deserving and needy

Digitized by Google

(LXX: εὖ ποιεῖν ἐνδεῆ).—Ver. 28. **And yet thou hast it**: literally, and it is yet with thee on hand, there is yet a store [there is with thee]. The LXX adds to this admonition to ready giving and to quick relief (according to the principle: *bis dat qui cito dat*, "he gives twice who gives quickly"), the words appropriate in themselves, "οὐ γὰρ οἶδας τί τέξεται ἡ ἐπιοῦσα" (for thou knowest not what the morrow shall bring forth), which, however, occur in their original place in chap. xxvii. 1.—Ver. 29. **Devise not evil.** The verb חָרַשׁ here as in vi. 14, 18; xii. 20; xiv. 22, expresses the idea of contriving, and that as a development of the idea of "forging" (Ez. xxi. 36) and not that of "ploughing" (as EWALD, following some older interpreters, maintains).—Ver. 30. **Without cause**, Heb. חִנָּם, LXX, μάτην, comp. δωρεάν in John xv. 25. What is meant by this "contending without cause" is made more apparent in the 2d member. In regard to the ethical significance of this precept comp. "Doctrinal and Ethical" notes, No. 3.—Ver. 31. **Emulate not the man of violence.** For this signification of אַל־תְּקַנֵּא, which is found as early as the Vulgate (*ne æmuleris hominem injustum*), the strongest support is the parallel thought in the 2d member; while unquestionably in passages like Ps. xxxvii. 1; lxxiii. 3; Prov. xxiv. 1, the expression קִנֵּא בְּ denotes rather a "falling into a passion" about some one, a "being envious." Yet comp. Prov. xxiii. 17, where the meaning plainly resembles that before us. [The difference among these expositors, we think, is more seeming than real. Thus STUART renders, "Be not envious toward," *etc.*, and explains "do not anxiously covet the booty which men of violence acquire;" MUENSCHER renders, "Envy thou not the man," *etc.*, and explains, "Do not be offended by the success and prosperity," *etc.*, "so as to imitate," *etc.*—A.]—**And choose none of his ways.** For תִּבְחַר the LXX (μηδὲ ζηλώσῃς) must have read תִּתְחַר, a reading which HITZIG is disposed to accept as the original. But how easily could this change be introduced, following as a standard Ps. xxxvii. 1, or Prov. xxiv. 19, where no doubt תִּתְחַר stands as the only appropriate reading!

Vers. 32-35 supply a ground in the first instance for the counsels contained in vers. 27-31, but further in general for those of the whole chapter: thus ver. 35 in particular, by its contrasting the comprehensive terms "fool" and "wise," reveals a far reaching breadth and compass in its reference, like the similar expressions at the close of the 1st and 2d chapters.—**An abhorrence to Jehovah is the deceiver.**—נָלוֹז, properly the "perverse," he who is deceitfully crooked and secret (comp. ii. 15), and so is in direct contrast with the "upright" or straightforward. [תּוֹעֵבָה, which in the E.V. is always translated by "abomination," or some cognate term, is often used in other sacred books of idolatry. In the twenty or more passages in the Book of Proverbs in which the word is found it has this signification in no single instance. "It would seem," says WORDSWORTH, *in loc.*, "as if, when Solomon wrote the Proverbs, he regarded *idolatry* as a thing *impossible*. He therefore left out idolatry as the Greek Legislator omitted parricide from his code—as a thing too monstrous to be contemplated. And yet Solomon himself afterwards fell into idolatry," *etc.*—A.].—**With the upright he maintains true friendship.**—Literally, "with the upright is his secret compact" (סוֹדוֹ), his intimacy, his confidential intimacy. Comp. Job xxix. 4; Ps. xxv. 14.—**Jehovah's curse dwells in the house of the wicked.**—Comp. the אָלָה, the cursing which, according to Zech. v. 4, will take possession of the house of the wicked, and destroy it (in accordance with Deut. xxviii. 17 sq.); and for the term מְאֵרָה, Mal. ii. 2 (and KÖHLER on both passages).

Ver. 34. **If he scorneth the scorners.**—To this hypothetical protasis the apodosis is not found in ver. 35, as BERTHEAU [and STUART] hold, but immediately after, in the second clause of ver. 34. As in Job viii. 20; Lam. iii. 32, there is an *argumentum a contrario*. Comp. our mode of constructing propositions, with "while on the one hand—so on the other." For the sentiment of the 1st member, comp. Ps. xviii. 26; for that of the whole verse the passages in the N. T. which cite freely from the LXX, 1 Pet. v. 5; James iv. 6, and also above, i. 26 sq.—Ver. 35. **Shame sweeps fools away.**—מֵרִים קָלוֹן literally "shame lifts up," *i. e.*, in order to sweep away and destroy them: Comp. Ez. xxi. 31; Is. lvii. 14, and the corresponding use of נָשָׂא, *tollere=auferre;* Is. xli. 16; Job xxvii. 21. The expression קָלוֹן, *ignominia*, properly *levitas* (lightness), at once reminds us directly of the familiar figure of chaff whirled away by the wind (Ps. i. 4; Is. xvii. 3; xxix. 5, *etc.*). Therefore we need not take מֵרִים as the predicate of כְּסִילִים (fools) and translate it by *suscipiunt* in the sense of "gather up," "carry away," as HITZIG does, following the LXX, Targ., VATABL., and ROSENMUELLER [so NOYES, MUENSCHER, WORDSW., while DE WETTE, STUART, *etc.*, agree with our author—A.]; although the distributive use of the participle in the singular instead of the plural, would have a sufficient parallel in the passage already explained, chap. iii. 18 *b*.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. "*Wisdom is life and gives life.*" This proposition, which finds its most pregnant utterance in ver. 18, and is formulated as a sort of Epitome of the whole chapter, is especially in the first admonitory discourse (vers. 1-18) expressed in manifold ways and exhibited in its bearing upon the most diverse relations, those of the present life first. Above all it is *long life*, to which walking in true wisdom aids (ver. iii. 16), and this for this reason,—because such a course is the indispensable condition of physical as well as spiritual health,—or because, as ver. 8 expresses it, "the wise findeth health for his body and refreshing for his frame." He who is truly wise aims infallibly at the needful temperance, and a prudent self-restraint in his physical and mental

Digitized by Google

regimen, and thereby promotes health, his inward and outward well-being in the highest possible degree. He contributes by his obedient subjection to the Divine grace, to the emancipation of his noblest spiritual powers and capacities,—secures these as well as the functions of his bodily organization against morbid excitement or torpidity, and so develops generally his entire personal life, body, mind and spirit, to its normal harmony, and the most vigorous manifestation possible of its diverse and cardinal activities. He who has in this way become inwardly free through the fear of God and real wisdom in life, attains necessarily also to the confirmation of this his godlike freedom and vital power in connection with the phenomena of the outward natural life, as surely as the laws of the economy of nature are the same as those of the ethical sphere in the kingdom of God. He who is inwardly free becomes also naturally free. To him who has attained true mastery over himself there is soon restored dominion over the outward creation,—that heritage of the true children of God from Paradise,—at least in its essentials. And so outward prosperity is added in his experience to inward peace; God "smooths his paths" (ver. 6); fills his garners and cellars with abundance (ver. 10), makes him great through riches and honor (ver. 16), and guides him during this whole life in ways of delight, peace, and prosperity (ver. 17; comp. vers. 2 and 18). A thing, however, that rises far above all these external blessings, above gold, silver and all the treasures of the earth (see vers. 14 and 15), is the grace and favor which the wise man finds not only with men, but much more with God (ver. 4). This *favor of God and of men*,—*i. e.*, not of all indiscriminately, but first and pre-eminently of the wise and devout, such as agree with God's judgment, is evidently in the view of the poet the highest and most precious of the multiform blessings of wisdom which he enumerates. What, however, is this "favor with God and men," the inseparable attendant and consequence of genuine wisdom (1 Sam. ii. 26; Luke ii. 52), what is this but the being a true child of God, the belonging to the fellowship of God and His people, the co-citizenship in the kingdom of truth and of blessedness?—We stand here manifestly at the point at which the eudæmonism of the author, in itself comparatively external and inclining to that which is partial and sensuous, joins hands with the true doctrine of Christianity,—where, therefore, the Old Testament doctrine of retributions predominantly earthly begins to be transformed into the supersensual or spiritual realistic doctrine of the New Testament (Matth. v. 10–12; xix. 28–30). For if to be a child of God and to stand in relations of grace appears as the chief value and most precious reward of wisdom, the goal of prosperity at which the lovers of this wisdom aim is far more a heavenly than an earthly one; and fellowship with God, obedient, loving dependence on Him, is then not merely the end, but at the same time the principle and motive for all the thought, effort and action of the wise. As a way to the attainment of this end no other whatsoever can come under consideration but that opened and pointed out by God himself—that is, the way of faith in the revelation of His grace. Believing self-devotion to the salvation which God bestows, which in the Old Testament is still essentially placed in the future, but in Christ as the Mediator of the New Testament, has become real and present, is there as well as here the condition of the attainment of wisdom, of progressive growth and strength in its possession, and finally of the enjoyment of the blessed reward. That our poet also walks in this path, that he is a representative of the "*fides Veteris Testamenti*," that he belongs to that host of witnesses, exemplars of faith under the Old Testament, which is brought before us in Hebrews xi.; this is incontrovertibly established by the way in which he speaks of the conditions of attaining to the blessed reward of wisdom, or of the practical demeanor of the wise man in its details. There we hear nothing of outward works of the law, of meritorious services, of the fulfilling of God's will with one's own strength or reason; but "trust in the Lord with all thine heart" is enjoined in emphatic contrast with "leaning upon one's own prudence" (ver. 5); the being "wise in one's own eyes" is put in significant contrast with the fear of God and the avoiding of all evil (ver. 7); yes, willing submission to God's salutary correction, humble and grateful subjection even to the strict disciplinary regulations which His fatherly love finds it good to employ; this constitutes the substance of the dispositions and modes of action which are here prescribed (vers. 11, 12; comp. Heb. xii. 5 sq.). With good reason did MELANCHTHON direct attention to the genuinely evangelical, and even profoundly Christian character of this admonition to the patient endurance of sufferings as wholesome disciplinary ordinances of God. He remarks on vers. 11, 12: "Here the whole doctrine of the cross is to be brought into view, and the distinction considered between Philosophy and the Gospel. Philosophy and human reason judge otherwise of the causes of death and of human calamities than does the voice of the Gospel. . . . . Christian and philosophic patience must also be distinguished." And further, on ver. 18 sq.: "These praises of wisdom are rightly understood of revealed wisdom, *i. e.*, of the word of God manifested in the Church, of the Decalogue and the Gospel. Nor yet is it strange that antiquity applied these praises to the person who is the Son of God, who is the revealer of the word resounding in the Church, and is efficient by this word, and in it shows forth what God is, and what is His will." How far, furthermore, the point of view of our teacher of wisdom is removed from all possible Antinomian disparagements of positive moral requirements, how clearly, on the other hand, the wisdom that he teaches appears to be regulated by both factors of Divine revelation, law and gospel, shows itself from the emphatic prominence given to "love and truth" (חֶסֶד וֶאֱמֶת ver. 8; comp. the previous analysis of these two ideas on p. 61) as the chief manifestations of a spirit that fears God, and of a scrupulously dutiful course in intercourse with one's neighbor. Love is, therefore, according to him, also, the fulfilling of the law (Rom. xiii. 10; Gal. v. 14), and indeed to such a degree that, according to his conception, the compliance with special pre-

Digitized by Google

scriptions of the positive external ceremonial law, *e. g.*, the ordinances which relate to the bringing of the offerings of first fruits (see above on ver. 9), must be to it an easy thing. With the proposition of BRUCH, that our author found himself in a sort of free-thinking opposition to the positive prescriptions of the Mosaic ceremonial law (comp. Introd., § 15, note), this admonition to a conscientious devotion of the first fruits to Jehovah, plainly cannot be reconciled.

2. As wisdom alone ensures true joy in life and abiding prosperity, it also shows itself man's most reliable protection (vers. 19-26), his defender and guardian in all the inward temptations as well as the outward dangers of this earthly life. And this essentially for this reason, because it consists in trusting devotion to the eternal and absolute wisdom of God, which most richly and gloriously manifests its exhaustless power, and its compassionate love and faithfulness, as formerly in the creation of the world, now also in its preservation and government. For he who loves wisdom is also loved by her; and he who by walking in faith, love, and the fear of God, confesses himself here below a friend of the Divine word,—in his behalf does the eternal Word make confession above before the throne of the Heavenly Father.—For further remarks upon the relation to the Logos or the Son of God, of the Divine wisdom, which is here in vers. 19-20, for the first time, hypostatically presented in its quality as the power that created the world, see below on chap. viii. 22 sq. (Doctrinal and Ethical comments). [As will be seen from the Exegetical notes on ver. 19, the best modern exegesis is not unanimous in applying this passage, like chap. viii., to the hypostatic wisdom. Our author's remarks, therefore, however just in themselves, may be regarded as here out of place, so far forth as they involve the personality of wisdom—A.]

3. The conditions for the attainment of true wisdom and its blessing, which are again emphasized in the concluding verses (27-35), are comprehended in the single requirement of love to one's neighbor as the fulfilling of the Divine law. As special manifestations of this love of our neighbor, we have made prominent, charitableness and constant readiness to give (27, 28), sincerity and an unfeigned frankness of disposition (29), peaceableness and placability (30), gentleness and abstinence from all violence (31), straightforward, honorable and upright deportment in one's general transactions (32, 33), humility and the avoidance of all arrogant, frivolous and scornful demeanor (34).—These admonitions do not rise to the full moral elevation of the New Testament's requisitions of love. Thus there is noticeably wanting here the demand of love to enemies, although not in chap. xxv. 21, and instead of this there is, it is true, no hatred of one's enemy recommended (as in the casuistic ethics of the later Pharisaic Judaism, according to Matth. v. 43), but yet a restriction of all dispute and controversy to one's relations with an actual offender; see ver. 30. The specification of duties to one's neighbor that is here presented is therefore related to one truly Christian, very much as the moral precepts which, according to Luke iii. 10-14, John the Baptist gave to the multitude that followed him, if compared with that fulfilment of the law presented by Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount as the standard for the conduct of the children of God under the New Testament (Matth. v. 20-48). Let us observe also the fact, which is certainly not accidental, that all the moral precepts in our passage are given in the form of negative imperatives or warnings, while, *e. g.*, in the Sermon on the Mount, in the concluding and admonitory chapters of Paul's Epistles, and in general in most of the counsels of the New Testament, the positively admonitory and preceptive tone has a decided preponderance over the prohibitory.

HOMILETIC AND PRACTICAL.

Homily on the entire chapter, starting with the central thought in ver. 18: True wisdom as a tree of life,—considered 1) in the precious fruits which it bestows upon us (1-18);—2) in the solid ground in which it is rooted (19-26);—3) in the cultivation which we must bestow upon it by a loving and faithful integrity (27-35).—Comp. M. GEIER's analysis of the chapter, which, treating the four introductory verses as an exordium for the whole, finds prescribed in it three main classes of duties: 1) to God (5-26);—2) to our neighbor (27-30);—3) to ourselves (31-35).—So STARKE: Solomon's exhortation to the manifestation of that piety which flows from true wisdom, viz.: 1) of piety in itself (1-12);—2) of wisdom as its celestial source (13-26);—3) of love to our neighbors as its chief earthly fruit and result (27-35).

Vers. 1-12. MELANCHTHON (on vers. 5-12, after treating the first four verses as an Introduction): Three precepts of divine wisdom; 1) Trust in God and fear of God (5-8);—2) the support of the ministry of the word by offerings and gifts (9, 10);—3) patience under crosses and sufferings (11, 12, comp. above, p. 65).—GEIER (on 5-18): Six cardinal duties to God: 1) confidence,—2) reverence,—3) humility,—4) honor, —5) patience,—6) zeal for wisdom.—STARKE: An exhortation to true piety; and 1) a preliminary encouragement to attention (1-4);—2) the direct admonition to the manifestation of true piety, a) in confidence in God (5),—b) in a living knowledge of God (6),—c) in the fear of the Lord with a renouncing of one's own wisdom (7, 8),—d) in the right payment of all gifts that are due (9, 10),—e) in the patient bearing of the cross (11, 12).—*Calwer Handb.*: The multiform blessings of a multiform wisdom; vers. 1, 2: long life, prosperity and peace;—3, 4: favor with God and men;—5, 6: a right guidance;—7, 8: even physical well-being;—9, 10: full garners and presses;—11, 12: grace from God also in trials and sufferings.

On vers. 1-4. EGARD: See to it that on the tablet of thine heart nothing be found but the word of God and Jesus Christ. According to what is written on the tablet of thine heart, (2 Cor. iii. 3) will endless pain or eternal joy await thee, Matth. x. 32, 33.—On vers. 5-8. HASIUS: It is a characteristic of true wisdom that one regards himself as simple; men who are wise in their own eyes are far removed from true wisdom.—ZELTNER: Where true fear of God exists,

Digitized by Google

there is also true humility of soul, and renunciation of self. Ecclesiast. i. 17, 18, *etc.*—[Ver. 5. TRAPP: They trust not God at all that do it not alone.—ARNOT: Trust is natural to the creature, though trust in the Lord be against the grain to the guilty. God complains as much of a divided allegiance as of none. In cleaving to Christ the effort to reserve a little spoils all. The command to "trust" is encouraging as well as reproving. The genuine spirit of adoption may be best observed in little things.—R. M. M'CHEYNE: Every enlightened believer trusts in a divine power enlightening the understanding; he therefore follows the dictates of the understanding more religiously than any other man.—Vers. 8. ARNOT: He who makes holiness happy in heaven, makes holiness healthful on earth.]—On vers. 9, 10. STARKE: We should above all things seek the kingdom of God, and share our means with those who labor in the word, and the extension of God's kingdom; but not hold our goods for gain in order so to avoid God's service. It is unbelief if one accounts that lost which he voluntarily devotes to churches and schools, and to the maintenance of the ministry of the word. Matth. x. 42; 2 Cor. ix. 6; Gal. vi. 6, *etc.*—ZELTNER: Thankfulness opens the fountain of the divine blessing, unthankfulness closes it.—STÖCKER: Liberality toward the clerical office, considered 1) in and by itself,—2) according to the manner of its exercise,—3) in its reward.—[W. BATES: Charity is a productive grace, that enriches the giver more than the receiver. The Lord signs Himself our debtor for what is laid out for Him, and He will pay it with interest].—On vers. 11, 12. EGARD: God's strokes are better than Satan's kiss and love; God smites for life, Satan caresses for death.—J. LANGE: The kingdom of God in this world is a kingdom of the cross; but all suffering tends evermore to the testing and confirmation of faith. 1 Pet. i. 6, 7. —*Berleb. Bible:* God's chastenings and corrections are no signs of anger, but of love; they are the pains which our healing and cure demand. Those who lie under the cross are often more acceptable to God, than those who taste and experience His dainties. He finds pleasure in our crosses and sufferings for this reason, because these are His remembrance and renewal of the sufferings of His Son. His honor is also involved in such a perpetuation of the cross in His members (Eph. iii. 13; Col. i. 24, *etc.*) and it is this that causes Him this peculiar joy!

[Vers. 11, 12. ARNOT: Let your heart flow down under trouble, for this is human; let it rise up also to God, for this is divine.—TRAPP: He that escapes affliction may well suspect his adoption. God's house of correction is His school of instruction.]

Vers. 13-18. EGARD: Silver, gold and pearls, serve and adorn the body only, wisdom, however, serves and adorns mainly the soul. As much as the soul is nobler than the body, so much is wisdom also nobler than all treasures. Beware lest thou with the children of this world look with delight upon the forbidden tree, and with them eat death from it. Beware lest thou choose folly instead of wisdom!—STÖCKER: Whosoever desires to regain what our first parents squandered and lost by the fall, namely, eternal life—let him hold fast upon heavenly wisdom—*i. e.*, God's revealed word. This is a tree of life to all those who in true faith lay hold upon it.—*Berleb. Bible:* Solomon here testifies that wisdom even in Paradise nourished and supported men, and that the same is for this reason also in the restoration (the restitution of all things by Christ, Acts iii. 21) ordained for their spiritual maintenance. In this originates that most blessed condition of the new man, who gradually becomes again like and equal to the man of Paradise.—WOHLFARTH: The tree of life of which we are to eat day by day is faith, love, hope. Faith is its trunk, hope its flowers, love its fruit.

[Vers. 16, 17. ARNOT:—If the law were according to a simple calculation in arithmetic, "the holiest liver, the longest liver," and conversely, "the more wicked the life the earlier its close;" if this, unmixed, unmodified, were the law, the moral government of God would be greatly impeded, if not altogether subverted. He will have men to choose goodness for His sake and its own; therefore a slight veil is cast over its present profitableness.—SOUTH (ver. 17): The excellency of the pleasure found in wisdom's ways appears 1) in that it is the pleasure of the mind;—2) that it never satiates nor wearies:—3) that it is in nobody's power, but only in his that has it.]

Vers. 19-26. STÖCKER:—Inasmuch as wisdom is so grand a thing that all was made and is still preserved by it, we are thence to infer that we also can be by it preserved for blessedness. We should hold dear the heavenly wisdom revealed to us in the word, and earnestly crave it, should learn to keep our eye upon God Himself, should entreat Him for all that we need, depend upon His omnipotence and faithful care, despond under no adversities, *etc.*, *etc.*—[BRIDGES: (Ver. 23) Habitual eyeing of the word keeps the feet in a slippery path].—STARKE: He who orders his ways to please the Lord, can in turn depend upon His gracious oversight and protection.—Our unrest and fear spring mainly from an evil conscience; divine wisdom however keeps the conscience from heavy sins, and stays the heart on God.—VON GERLACH: The wisdom which God imparts to the man who hearkens for His voice is no other than that by which He founded the earth; the holy order, which forms, keeps, supports, holds together, develops into life, advances all. As now all that God has made is very good, each thing according to the law of the divine order that dwells in it, so in and for man all becomes good that conforms to this order.—WOHLFARTH (on ver. 21-26): The holy rest of the pious. Little as the heart's innocence, this fairest fruit of wisdom, can preserve and wholly free us from the sufferings which God suspends over us for our refining, so surely however does it turn away the worst and saddest consequences of sin, and ensures even amidst the storms of this life a rest that nothing can disturb.—[Ver. 26. ARNOT: It is the peace of God in the heart that has power to keep the feet out of evil in the path of life.]—Ver. 27-35. STÖCKER: The virtues of beneficence and patience are here developed after the method of the second table of the ten commandments; it is therefore taught how the believing Christian is in his relations to his neighbor to exercise

Digitized by Google

himself in true charity, steadfast patience and forbearance.—CRAMER (in STARKE): When God richly bestows upon us spiritual treasures, ought it to be a great matter, if we to honor Him give alms from our temporal goods?—(On ver. 32 sq.); If an ungodly man rises in prosperity, look not upon his prosperity, but upon his end; that can easily deter you from imitating him.—WOHLFARTH (on vers. 27, 28): Thankfulness toward God requires beneficence toward one's brethren.—VON GERLACH: Divine wisdom teaches the true communism,—makes all things common. According to true love earthly goods belong to "their lord" (ver. 27) *i. e*, to him who needs them.—[Ver. 27. ARNOT: The poor have not a right which they can plead and enforce at a human tribunal. The acknowledgment of such a right would tend to anarchy. The poor are placed in the power of the rich, and the rich are under law to God.—Ver. 33. ARNOT: In addition to the weight of divine authority upon the conscience, all the force of nature's instincts is applied to drive it home.—Ver. 34. TRAPP: Humility is both a grace and a vessel to receive grace.]

Second Group of Admonitory or Gnomic Discourses.

CHAP. IV. 1—VII. 27.

7. Report of the teacher of wisdom concerning the good counsels in favor of piety, and the warnings against vice, which were given him in his youth by his father.

CHAP. IV. 1–27.

1 Hearken, ye children, to a father's instruction,
and attend to know understanding:
2 for I give you good doctrine;
forsake not my law.
3 For I was also a son to my father;
a tender and only (son) for my mother;
4 and he taught me and said to me:
"Let thine heart hold fast my words;
keep my commandments and thou shalt live!
5 Get wisdom, get understanding;
forget not, turn not from the words of my mouth!
6 Forsake her not and she shall preserve thee;
love her and she shall keep thee.
7 The highest thing is wisdom; get wisdom,
and with all that thou hast gotten get understanding!
8 Esteem her and she will exalt thee,
will bring thee honor if thou dost embrace her.
9 She will put upon thine head a graceful garland,
a glorious crown will she bestow upon thee.
10 Hearken, my son, and receive my sayings;
and the years of thy life shall be many.
11 In the way of wisdom have I taught thee,
I have guided thee in right paths.
12 When thou goest thy step shall not be straitened,
and when thou runnest thou shalt not stumble.
13 Hold fast upon instruction; let not go;
keep her, for she is thy life.
14 Into the path of the wicked enter thou not,
and walk not in the way of the evil.
15 Avoid it, enter not upon it;
turn from it, and pass away.
16 For they sleep not unless they sin;
their sleep is taken away unless they have caused (others) to fall;

Digitized by Google

17 for they eat the bread of wickedness,
and the wine of violence do they drink.
18 But the path of the just is like the light of dawn,
that groweth in brightness till the perfect day.
19 The way of the wicked is as darkness,
they know not at what they stumble.
20 My son, attend to my words,
incline thine ear to my sayings.
21 Let them not depart from thine eyes:
keep them in the midst of thine heart.
22 For they are life to those who find them,
and to their whole body health.
23 Above all that is to be guarded keep thy heart,
for out of it flow the currents of life.
24 Put away from thee perverseness of mouth,
and waywardness of lips put far from thee.
25 Thine eyes should look straight forward,
and thine eyelids look straight before thee.
26 Make straight the path of thy foot
and let all thy ways be established.
27 Turn not to the right or to the left,
remove thy foot from evil!"

GRAMMATICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 2. [נָתַתִּי, an "affirmative" perfect (Bött. § 947, *f.*), anticipating a sure result, and so confirming confidence; not merely have I already given, *etc.;* it will always be found true. See like instances in ver. 11.—A.].

Ver. 10. [A masculine verb agreeing with a fem. subject, the more readily because the verb precedes. The same thing recurs in ver. 25; in v. 2; vii. 11; x. 21, 32; xv. 7: xvi. 3; xviii. 6.—A.]

Ver. 13. The fem. suffix in נִצְּרֶהָ refers strictly to חָכְמָה [מוּסָר being masculine], which idea, on account of its close relationship, could be easily substituted for מוּסָר (comp. i. 3; xv. 33), and all the more readily because this idea was constantly before the poet's mind as the main subject of his discourse. Like anomalies in the gender of suffixes may be found, *e. g.*. in Isa. iii. 16, Judg. xxi 21. [To emphasize the injunction the form of the verb is expanded from the simple נִצְרָהּ by doubling the middle radical by Dagesh forte *dirimens*, and by attaching the suffix in its fullest form. See Bött. § 500, 12; §§ 1042, *b*, 1043, 6.—A.].

Ver. 14. [Fuerst takes תְּאַשֵּׁר in its more common causative and therefore transitive sense, supplying as its object לִבְּךָ; he reaches, however, the same result. The third declarative use of the Piel we have not found given here by any modern commentator.—A.].

Ver. 16. [For the form given in the K'thibh יִכְשׁוֹלוּ, see Green, § 88, Bött. § 367, *β*.—A.].

Ver. 20. [The paragogic Imperative usually and naturally takes its place at the beginning of the clause; הַקְשִׁיבָה here, and in ver. 1 follows its object as well as the vocative בָּנַי. Bött. § 960, *c*.—A.].

Ver. 21. יַלִּיזוּ fut. Hiphil from לוּז with a doubling of the first radical, as in יַלִּינוּ from לוּן. [Verb עו treated like a verb עע,—Green, § 160, 1; Bött., § 1147, B. 3.—A.].

Ver. 25. [Holden makes לְנֹכַח an object and not an adverbial modifier—"behold that which is right." This can hardly be reconciled with the strict meaning of נֹכַח. For the peculiar יַיְשִׁרוּ, in which the first radical retains fully its consonant character, resisting quiescence, see Stuart, § 69, 2; Green, § 150, 1; Bött., § 458, *a*, § 498, 12.—A.]

EXEGETICAL.

1. The address to the sons, *i. e.*, the pupils or hearers of the teacher of wisdom, in the plural number, appearing for the first time in ver. 1, and then recurring twice afterward, in v. 7 and vii. 24 (as well as in one later instance, in the discourse of the personified Wisdom, chap. viii. 32) announces the beginning of a new and larger series of proverbial discourses. This extends to the end of chap. vii., and is characterized by a preponderance of warning, and also by the clear and minute delineation of the by-paths of folly and vice which are to be avoided, that now takes the place of the tone, hitherto predominant, of positive appeals to strive after wisdom and the fear of God. A starting point for these admonitory discourses is furnished by the communication made in the preceding chapter, concerning the good instructions which the author as a child had had urged upon his notice by his father. The negative or admonitory import of these teachings of the father is now more fully developed in the discourses, some longer, some shorter, of the next three chapters. And among these special prominence is given to sins against chastity, which had not, it is true, been expressly named by the father, but still must now come under consideration as involving dangers especially seductive and ruinous for the son, as he grew up from boyhood to youth. To these there-

Digitized by Google

fore the poet reverts no less than three times in the course of the admonitions which he attaches to his account of the precepts of his father as given in chap. iv. (viz., v. 3 sq.; vi. 24 sq.; vii. 5 sq). And in each instance the transition is made in a peculiarly natural way, and with a far more complete delineation of the repulsive details than had been earlier given on a similar occasion (chap. iii. 16-19). Of the older expositors *e. g.*, EGARD, J. LANGE, STARKE, and of the more recent ELSTER are in favor of extending the father's admonition from ver. 4 to the end of this chapter. In favor of these limits may be adduced especially the fact that vers. 26, 27 form a peculiarly appropriate conclusion for the father's discourse,—far more so not only than ver. 9 (with which JEROME, BEDE, LAVATER, the *Würtemberg Bible*, and most commentators of modern times, *e. g.*, EWALD, BERTHEAU, HITZIG, [MUENSCHER, KAMPH.] would close the discourse) but also than ver. 20, (to which point *e. g.*, UMBREIT would extend it). Against those who would regard chap. v. 1-6 as also belonging to the father's address (HANSEN, DELITZSCH) we have the substance of these verses, which, at least from ver. 3 onward, seem no longer appropriate to an admonition addressed to a boy still "tender" (see iv. 3); we have besides the still more weighty fact that chap. v. forms an indivisible whole, from which the first six verses can plainly not be separated, on account of the reference to them contained in ver. 8. It is furthermore by no means necessary that the address "ye sons" (v. 7) should stand at the very commencement of the discourse where the poet resumes it. In reply to HITZIG who, for the sake of restoring a symmetrical relation of numbers, in the present chapter once more pronounces certain verses spurious (vers. 16, 17 and 27), see the special remarks on these verses.

2. Ver. 1-3. **Hearken, ye children.** It seems quite certain that this address, occurring only here and in chap. v. 7 and chap. vii. 24, is occasioned by the fact, that the author designed to represent himself in and after ver. 4 as himself a son and the object of his father's counsels and warnings. The aim was to present the example of the one son plainly before the many sons; for this is the relation in which the teacher of wisdom conceives of his hearers or readers. For this reason again he does not say, "*my* sons," but "*ye* sons, ye children," here as well as in chap. v. 7.—**To a father's correction,** *i. e.*, to the instruction of a man who is your spiritual father; not to the instruction of your several fathers. For, just as in chap. i. 8, the author does not intend in the first line to exhort to obedience to parents, but simply to obedience in general.—**To learn understanding.** The לָדַעַת בִּינָה here corresponds with לָדַעַת חָכְמָה in the superscription, chap. i. 2, and is therefore to be similarly understood. HITZIG's idea "to know *with the understanding*" is evidently needlessly artificial.—Ver. 2. **For good doctrine,** *etc.* לֶקַח, something received, handed over (see on i. 5); the author here describes his doctrine in this way because he himself received the substance of it from his father. The LXX here translate the word outright by δῶρον (Vulg. *donum*).—Ver. 3. **For I also was a son to my father,** *i. e.*, "I also once stood in the relation to my (actual) father, in which you stand to me, your paternal instructor," (BERTHEAU). [MUENSCH. less forcibly makes כִּי temporal: *when* I was, *etc.*]—**A tender and only** (son) **to my mother,** strictly, **before** my mother, in her sight; comp. Gen. xvii. 18. The mention of the mother is probably occasioned here, as in i. 8, by the poetic parallelism; for in what follows it does not occur again.—**Tender,** רַךְ, not equivalent, as sometimes, to "susceptible of impressions, tractable," as the LXX conceive in translating it by ὑπήκοος; but the expression, in connection with יָחִיד, "an only one" (comp. Gen. xxii. 2), indicates that the child has been to his parents an object of tender care; comp. Gen. xxxiii. 13, where Jacob speaks of the tenderness of his children. Furthermore the LXX, doubtless in remembrance of the fact that Solomon, according to 1 Chron. iii. 5, was not the only son of his mother, renders יָחִיד by ἀγαπώμενος (beloved). That several ancient manuscripts and versions have substituted for לִפְנֵי אִמִּי, לִבְנֵי אִמִּי, the *sons* of my mother, doubtless rests upon the same consideration. The earlier exegesis in general thought far too definitely of Solomon as the only speaking subject in the whole collection of proverbs, and therefore imagined itself obliged in every allusion to a "father" or a "mother" of the poet, to think specifically of David and Bathsheba. This is also the explanation of the fact that the LXX in the verse following exchanged the singular, "he taught me and said," for a plural (οἳ ἔλεγον καὶ ἐδίδασκόν με), and accordingly represented all that follows as instruction proceeding from both parents.

3. Vers. 4-9. **Let thine heart hold fast my words.** The father's instruction begins quite in the same style as all the other admonitions in this first main division of the Book of Proverbs. At the end of ver. 4 the Syrian Version adds the words "and my law as the apple of thine eye," which is, however, plainly a supplementary gloss from chap. vii. 2, in which passage also the expression occurs, "keep my commandments and thou shalt live." BERTHEAU regards the addition as original here also, in order thus to do away with the peculiarity of three members in ver. 4 (which is surrounded by nothing but distichs), and to make of the three clauses four. But the triple structure owes its origin simply to the fact that the first member, as an introductory formula for the following discourse, must necessarily be made to stand outside the series of clauses which are otherwise always arranged in pairs.—Ver. 5. **Get wisdom, get understanding,** literally, "*buy* wisdom, *buy* understanding." The doubling of the verb makes the demand more vehement; as UMBREIT explains it, an "imitation of the exclamation of a merchant who is offering his wares."—**Forget not, turn not from the words of my mouth.** The zeugma appears only in the translation, not in the original, since the verb

Digitized by Google

שָׁכַח elsewhere, *e. g.*, Ps. cii. 5, is found construed with מִן. In the idea of forgetting there is naturally involved a turning aside or away from the object.—Ver. 7. **The highest thing is wisdom.** This is the interpretation to be here given, with HITZIG (following MERCER, DE DIEU and some older expositors), to the expression רֵאשִׁית חָכְמָה. It is usually rendered "The beginning of wisdom," [*e.g.* by the LXX, Vulg., LUTHER] and the following clauses, "get wisdom, *etc.*" are taken as the designation of that in which the beginning of wisdom consists, *viz.*, in the "resolution to get wisdom" (UMBREIT), or in the instant observance of the admonition which relates to this (comp. ELSTER on this passage [and also KAMPH.]). But as the beginning of wisdom the fear of God is every where else designated (see Obs. on i. 7); and for the absolute use of רֵאשִׁית in the sense of *præstantissimum, summum* (the highest, most excellent thing) we may compare on the one hand Job xxix. 25, and on the other Gen. i. 1.—**And with all that thou hast gotten get understanding.** The beautiful verbal correspondence in the Hebrew phrase is well indicated in the above rendering [in which the ambiguity of the E. V. is avoided; *with* is not to be taken in the sense of *in connection with*, but *with the expenditure of*, or *at the price of*,—German *um* or *für*]. For the thought comp. iii. 14 sq.—Ver. 8. **Esteem her.** The verb סַלְסֵל which occurs only here,—the Pilel of סלל,—might possibly, as an intensive formed from this verb, which as is well known signifies "to heap up, to build a way by mounds and embankments," express the idea of enclosing with a wall, of a firm surrounding and enclosure. So the LXX understood it, translating by περιχαράκωσον αὐτήν; so also the Chald., Syr., Vulg., and several modern interpreters, *e. g.*, BERTHEAU,—all of whom find expressed in the word the idea of a loving clasp and embrace. It is however probably simpler and more in accordance with the sense of רוֹמֵם in the parallel clause to take the word, as ABEN EZRA, LUTHER, and most modern interpreters do, in the sense of "to exalt, esteem;" [So H., M., N., St. agreeing with the E. V.]. With this conception also the second clause best agrees, for in this there is added to the exhortation to prize and honor wisdom, the other admonition to love her.—**If thou dost embrace her.** Wisdom here appears personified as a loved one or wife, whom one lovingly draws to him, and embraces: comp. v. 20; Eccl. iii. 5.— Ver. 9. **She will put upon thy head a graceful wreath.** Comp. i. 9.—**Will she bestow upon thee.** The rare verb מִגֵּן which again in Hos. xi. 8 stands parallel with נָתַן, according to this passage and Gen. xiv. 20 undoubtedly signifies to offer, to give, to present some one with something (construed with two accusatives). The old translations took it sometimes in the sense of protecting (LXX: ὑπερασπίσῃ σου; Vulg.; *proteget te;* so the Syriac), as though it were a denominative from מָגֵן, shield. With this, however, the "glorious crown" does not correspond, which is evidently introduced as an ornament, and not as a protection and defence.

4. Vers. 10-19. The father instructs his son concerning the way of wisdom (vers. 11, 18) in which he should walk, in contrast with the ruinous path of impiety (vers. 14, 19).—**So shall the years of thy life be many.** Comp. chap. iii. 2. [WORDSWORTH says "This word חַיִּים is plural in the original, as in iii. 2, as if Solomon would comprehend the future life with the present, and add Eternity to Time." He forgets that the abstract idea of life is never expressed by the singular of this noun except as its *stat. constr.* חַי is used in formulas of adjuration, *e. g.*, Gen. xlv. 15, 16; 1 Sam. i. 26, *etc.* See Lexicons generally, and BÖTT. § 697, 2. § 689, B. *a.* A.]—Ver. 11. **In the way of wisdom,** *i. e.*, not "in the way *to* wisdom," but in the way in which Wisdom walks, here also again as it were personified,—a way which is lovely and peaceful (according to iii. 17), a way with "right paths" (lit., "paths of straightness," comp. ii. 9, 12) as the 2d member and the following verse describe it (comp. Job xviii. 7).—[Ver. 12. The peculiar significance of such promises to an inhabitant of Palestine, see illustrated, *e. g.*, in HACKETT's *Illustrations of Scripture*, p. 20.—A.].—Ver. 13. **Hold fast upon instruction; let not go; keep her; she is thy life,** as the bestower of long life; iii. 2, 16, 18; see below, ver. 23.—Ver. 14. **And walk not,** *etc.* אִשֵּׁר properly, to go straight on, here used of the bold, arrogant walk of the presumptuous; comp. ix. 6; xxiii. 19. To translate אַל־תְּאַשֵּׁר by "do not pronounce happy" (comp. iii. 18) as the LXX, Vulg., and Syr. propose, contradicts the parallelism with "enter not" in the first member.—Ver. 15. **Avoid it.** On פָּרַע to abhor, reject, comp. i. 25.—**Turn from it and pass away,**—*i. e.*, even if thou hast entered upon it (עָלָיו) still turn aside from it and choose another way, which carries thee by the ruinous end of that one.—Ver. 16, 17. **For they cannot sleep unless they sin,** *etc.* HITZIG thinks that in this reference to the energy of the wicked in sinning there can be found no appropriate ground for the warning in ver. 15; he therefore declares vers. 16, 17 a spurious interpolation, and at the same time inverts the order of the two following verses, *i. e.*, makes the 19th the 18th; he then connects the כִּי, "for," the only genuine fragment remaining of ver. 16, immediately with the דֶּרֶךְ רְשָׁעִים *etc.*, of ver. 18 (19); "For . . . . the way of the wicked is as midnight, *etc.*" Since however no ancient MSS. or translation exhibits anything that favors this emendation, and since a certain irregular movement, an abandonment of that order of ideas which would seem simpler and more obvious, corresponds in general with the style of our author (comp. i. 16 sq.; iii. 8 sq.; viii. 4 sq.), we may fairly disregard so violent a treatment. Besides, the substance of vers. 16, 17, so far forth as they depict the way of the wicked as a restless, cruel and abominable course of procedure, is plainly quite pertinent as the foundation of a warning against this way. And

Digitized by Google

that subsequently the concluding description of this way as a way of darkness (ver. 19) is not introduced until after the contrasted representation of the way of the pious (ver. 18), is an arrangement favorable to the general rhetorical effect of the whole, like several which we have already found, especially in chap. iii. 34, 35, and also at the end of chapters i. and ii.—**Unless they have caused** (others) **to fall**, *i. e.*, unless they have betrayed into sin; the object—*viz.*, others, in general—does not need to be here distinctly expressed. For the Hiphil יַכְשִׁילוּ, which should be the reading here according to the K'ri, in the ethical sense of "causing to stumble" in the way of truth and uprightness, comp. especially Mal. ii. 8, where the "causing to fall" is brought into even closer connection than in our passage with the idea of "turning from the way." [The K'thibh would require the translation "they have stumbled," *i. e.*, (figuratively) sinned].—**For they eat bread of wickedness, and wine of violence do they drink.** Against the translation of Schultens, Muentinghe, Umbreit, Elster, [Kamphausen]: "for wickedness do they eat as bread, and violence do they drink as wine" (comp. Job xv. 16; xxxiv. 7), may be adduced the position of the words, which should rather stand somewhat in this way—for they have eaten wickedness as bread for themselves—if designed to convey the meaning of a mere comparison. The expressions "bread of wickedness, wine of violent deeds," plainly conveying a stronger meaning, remind us of the "bread of affliction," Deut. xvi. 3; of the "bread of sorrows," Psalm cxxvii. 2, and likewise of the "wine of the condemned" (יֵין אֲנוּשִׁים) Am. ii. 8.

Ver. 18, 19. **Like the light of dawn that groweth in brightness till the perfect day**, literally, "that grows and brightens (familiar Hebrew idiom, as in Judges iv. 24; Esth. ix. 4; comp. Ewald, *Lehrb.* 280 *b.*) even to the establishing of the day." נְכוֹן (*const. state* of the part. Niphal of כּוּן) lit., the established, the (apparently) stationary position of the sun at noon (comp. the Greek τὸ σταθερὸν τῆς μεσημβρίας, which however the LXX do not here employ). For נֹגַהּ, used of the brightness of the rising sun, comp. Isa. lx. 3; lxii. 1. The comparison of the path, *i. e.*, the moral course, of the just with the light of the rising sun, bright and ever brightening, is most appropriate. If the whole path is light, a bright, clear knowledge of salvation, illumination by the heavenly light of divine revelation (comp. vi. 23; xxviii. 5; Isa. ii. 5, *etc.*) there can naturally be no idea of stumbling and falling suggested (comp. John xi. 9, 10); rather will he who walks in this way attain more and more to perfect clearness in the inward state of his heart and conscience, and therewith also in increasing measure to outward prosperity.—**The way of the wicked is as darkness**, the exact opposite to that of the righteous. אֲפֵלָה strictly "thick darkness," midnight gloom. The degree of this darkness and its evil consequences for him who walks in it, the 2d clause clearly depicts; comp. John xi. 9, 10, and for the general subject, the previous delineation of the sudden destruction of the ungodly, i. 27 sq.; also ii. 18, 22; iii. 35.

5. Ver. 20-27. The father's admonition closes with an urgent warning to the son against forgetting this counsel, with a special reference to the ruinous consequences which such a forgetting will ensure.—**Let them not depart from thine eyes.** The meaning is "depart, escape," just as in iii. 21. Bertheau's interpretation is needlessly artificial,—"let them not withdraw them" (3 Plur. without a definite subject), *i. e.*, let them not be withdrawn.—Ver. 22. **For they are life to those who find them**: comp. iii. 2, 16; iv. 13; and especially for the use of "find" in the sense of to attain or to be blessed with anything, see iii. 13; viii. 35.—**And to their whole body health.** Comp. iii. 8, where רִפְאוּת is found instead of the מַרְפֵּא of our passage.—Ver. 23. **Above all that is to be guarded keep thy heart** מִכָּל־מִשְׁמָר literally, "more than every object of watching," for this is beyond all question the sense of מִשְׁמָר, and not, as Aben Ezra and Jarchi take it, "a thing against which one must guard," which would not correspond with the radical meaning of שָׁמַר. The heart as the chief object of moral watchfulness, is plainly nothing but the conscience, the pure moral consciousness of man, the ἀγαθὴ συνείδησις, 1 Tim. i. 5, 19; 1 Pet. iii. 16. So Hitzig, with unquestionable correctness, referring to Ps. li. 10; Job xxvii. 6; 1 Sam. xxv. 31.—**For out of it (flow) currents of life.** Lit., "issues of life" (Bertheau) *i. e.*, of life in the physico-organic as well as in the ethical sense; of life so far forth as it manifests itself in the normal course and movement of the functions of the bodily organism, just as also in the full development of the spiritual powers and their working upon external nature. Comp. remarks on ii. 8 sq. Hitzig also, who translates תּוֹצְאוֹת חַיִּים not quite appropriately by "paths of life," admits the fact that the expression rests upon the recognition of the heart as the seat and fountain of the blood, and therefore also as the central home of the entire life of the physical being (in accordance with Lev. xvii. 11; Deut. xii. 23; and in opposition to Bertheau, who denies this reference). So also Umbreit, except that he, with a view somewhat partial and obscure, conceives of the heart as the "seat of the sensibilities," and the life that flows from it as the "general sensation of being." ["All vital principles are lodged there, and only such as are good and holy will give you pleasure. The exercises of religion will be pleasant when they are natural, and flow easily out of their own fountain." John Howe, *Delighting in God.*—A.].—Ver. 24. **Put away from thee perverseness of mouth,** *etc.* "Following the first clause of ver. 23 the 24th and 25th verses warn against an arbitrary perverting of the moral judgment, into which evil passions so easily betray, and admonish not to give a misdirection to thought (the *acies animi*) within the department of morality" (Hitzig).—**Let thine eyes look straight forward,** *etc.* A prohibition not of an indolent "gazing about" (Bertheau), but of the false

Digitized by Google

and evil look of the self-seeking, who does not intend honorable dealing with his neighbor, but seeks in all his course and dealing to outwit, to deceive and overpower him; comp. vi. 13; x. 10; xvi. 30; Ecclesiast. xxvii. 25; Matth. vi. 23.—Ver. 26. **Make straight the path of thy foot.** Plainly something that is possible only in connection with eyes that look straight forward and correctly; this is therefore the necessary practical consequence of the course commended in the preceding verse. He only who is from the heart honorable and upright is able also in the individual forms of his moral action to avoid every false step.—**Let all thy ways be established.** יִכֹּנוּ does not mean "let them be sure" (BERTH.), but "let them be definite, fixed," which can be the case only with a course rightly regulated, straightforward, and sure; comp. Ps. cxix. 133: Heb. xii. 13. The latter passage plainly contains an allusion to our verse, the first member of which according to the LXX reads: Ὀρθὰς τροχιὰς ποίει σοῖς ποσίν.—Ver. 27. **Turn not to the right or to the left, keep thy foot far from evil.** This fuller explanation of that fixedness and certainty of the way which is demanded in ver. 26 completes the father's admonition in a way altogether appropriate, and is therefore neither to be declared, with HITZIG, a spurious addition, nor is it, in agreement with BERTHEAU, to be deprived of its position and meaning as a concluding appeal, by receiving into the text as genuine the two verses which appear after it in the LXX (and Vulgate): Ὁδοὺς γὰρ τὰς ἐκ δεξιῶν οἶδεν ὁ θεός, διεστραμμέναι δέ εἰσιν αἱ ἐξ ἀριστερῶν. Αὐτὸς δὲ ὀρθὰς ποιήσει τὰς τροχιάς σου, τὰς δὲ πορείας σου ἐν εἰρήνῃ προάξει. These two verses, whose substance appears to be a mere repetition from vers. 26, and 27, seem to owe their origin to the design to secure here again, as in the preceding section (vers. 10-19) a full decade of verses. In opposition to this view, arbitrary and theoretical, that the structure of the paragraphs or strophes in the chapters before us is uniformly equal, *i. e.*, always consisting of ten verses—a view to which even BERTHEAU attaches much importance—see, above, the Exeget. Notes on chap. 3, No. 1.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

The counsel given by the pious and wise father to his son begins with the appeal to him to hold fast his words (ver. 4), and ends with an earnest warning against a course made insecure and dangerous by disregard of these words (vers. 20-27). *Obedience to the word of revealed truth as transmitted within the community of the children of God, and bequeathed by parents to their sons,*—this is the general statement of the import of the demands of this chapter as a whole, so far forth as it may be reduced to a single brief expression. It is essentially, as MELANCTHON says, "*adhortationes ad studium obedientiæ et ad diligentiam regendi disciplinam*," that are contained in this passage. The whole is a chapter on *the right* (Christian) *training of children*, an exhibition of the nature of that chief manifestation of the Hhokmah [practical wisdom], which in the general superscription of the book (i. 3; comp. i. 7) was designated as מוּסָר or *discipline*.* To this chief end, the holding his son to discipline, to obedience, and the cherishing of his wholesome words and teachings, all the other prominent ideas which find expression in the father's discourse are made subservient; the exhibition of wisdom as the one costly jewel, whose acquisition is above every other, and if necessary, at the cost of all other possessions, to be sought and secured (vers. 5-9; comp. Matth. xiii. 44-46); the emphatic admonition to be subject to "discipline," and not to let it go, even because it is *the life* of the true and obedient child of God (ver. 13); the clear delineation of the two paths; the way of darkness in which the ungodly walk, and the way of light in which the pious and wise are found (vers. 14-19); the counsel to guard with all diligence not merely the word of truth received into the heart (vers. 20-22; comp. the ἔμφυτος λόγος, Jas. i. 18), but also the heart itself, as the seat of the conscience, and the source of all life and prosperity (ver. 23); and finally the commendation of a life of honor and integrity, without turning to the right hand or to the left, as the salutary result of that inward disposition which is both pure and sure (vers. 24-27). That a pure heart, *i. e.*, one purified by the grace of God, and with this a firm heart, *i. e.*, one firmly rooted in truth as its ground, is the source and common fountain for the successful development of all the main activities and functions of human life, those belonging to the sphere of sense, as well as to the psychical and spiritual realms, and that this must more and more manifest itself as such a centre of the personality, sending forth light and life;—this thought, expressed in ver. 23 in a way peculiarly vigorous and suggestive, unquestionably presents the most profound, comprehensive and controlling truth, that the father, in the course of his counsels and warnings, gives to his son, standing before the portal of the school of life, to be borne with him on his way (comp. the advice of Tobias to his son: Tob. iv. 6).—Yet we must also mark as one of the most noteworthy of the fundamental ideas of this discourse, the designation, contained in ver. 7, of wisdom as the "chief thing," which is to be sought above all things else, and to be prized above all possessions and treasures. Yet this passage probably requires a different conception and application from that which is usually found,—so far forth as the thought which has already been expressed, *e. g.*, above, in chap. ii. 8 sq., "that one must practise wisdom to become wise" (comp. MELANCHTHON on this passage; STARKE, and of recent writers, especially ELSTER), probably does not correspond with the true import of רֵאשִׁית חָכְמָה; the expression being designed rather to serve for the designation of wisdom as the highest end of all human counsel and action.

* In this particular, BOHLIUS certainly took the correct view, that in his otherwise remarkable classification of the contents of the first nine chapters according to the seven *principia ethices divinæ deductiva* (Daath, Binah, Sechel, Tuschijah, Musar, Mezimmah, Ormah), he assigns to the 4th chapter the Musar (or the *colligata informatio*, as he explains the term). See *Ethica Sacra*, Disp. VI., p. 65 sq.

Digitized by Google

HOMILETIC AND PRACTICAL.

Homily on the entire chapter: The two paths in which youth can walk,—that of obedience and that of vice (or the way of wisdom and that of folly; the way of light and that of darkness; comp. the minute picture of the two ways in the *Ep. Barnabæ*, § 18-20).—Educational Sermon: The fundamental principles of a truly Christian education of children, exhibited according to the standard of the counsels of a sage of the Old Testament to his son. 1st principle: True wisdom (which is equivalent to the fear of God) the highest end of all regulations adopted in the educational action of parents (vers. 4-9); 2d principle: As means to this end, an earnest insisting both upon the reward of walking in the light, and upon the punishment for walking in darkness (vers. 10-19); 3d principle: Results to be anticipated simply from this, that God's word be received and cherished in a susceptible and good heart (vers. 20-27).—Comp. Stöcker: Warning against evil companionship: 1) the simple command that one must avoid evil company (vers. 1-19); 2) the way in which this can be done (vers. 20-27).—Starke: How David admonishes Solomon: 1) to the reception of wisdom (4-13); 2) to the avoidance of impiety (14-19); 3) to the practice of piety (20-27).

Vers. 4-9. Starke:—Should the case arise, that one must lose either true wisdom or all temporal good, forego rather the latter; for wisdom is better than gold (chap. xvi. 16; Matth. xix. 29). Honor, accomplishments, graces, esteem, each man desires for himself. If thou wouldst attain this wish of thine, then seek wisdom; she gloriously rewards her admirers.—[Ver. 4. Bridges:—This heart-keeping is the path of life. Goulburn:—Endeavor to make your heart a little sanctuary, in which you may continually realize the presence of God, and from which unhallowed thoughts and even vain thoughts must carefully be excluded.]—*Berleb. Bible:*—The two conditions of the Christian life: 1) its commencement, the seeking and finding of wisdom (ver. 7, according to the common interpretation); 2) its continuance, dependent upon preserving wisdom, and thereby being preserved, advanced, and brought to honor by it (vers. 8, 9).—[Ver. 7. Trapp: Make religion thy business: other things do by the by].—Vers. 10-19. Hasius: To set one's foot in the way of good is ofttimes not so difficult as to go vigorously forward in it. The power of temptation is great; the tinder of vice is naturally in us; even a little spark can kindle it.—Zeltner: Impossible as it is that a stone fall into the water and remain dry, so impossible is it that a lover of evil company be not betrayed, Ecclesiast. xiii. 7; 1 Cor. xv. 33.—[Ver. 18. Arnot: The sun is an emblem not of the justified, but of the justifier. Christ alone is the source of light: Christians are only its reflectors. The just are those whom the Sun of righteousness shines upon; when they come beneath His healing beams, their darkness flies away. They who once were darkness are light now, but it is "in the Lord."]—Starke: The pious can avoid the snares of destruction through the light of the Holy Spirit; but the ungodly stumble in darkness and fall into the pits of death. As one from darkness walks on in darkness, so from light into light (ver. 18; comp. Prov. xii. 28; Ps. lxxxiv. 7; Job v. 12-14).—*Berleb. Bible:* The soul in its conversion to God must 1) hear His word; 2) receive the influence of this word, and by it be directed to the way of truth; 3) be guided by God in this way; 4) under God's guidance and protection learn so to run in this way that it shall nowhere stumble nor fall.—[Ver. 19. Emmons: Sinners are in such darkness that they are insensible to the objects that are leading them to ruin: thus they stumble *a*) at the great deceiver; *b*) at one another; *c*) at Divine Providence; *d*) at their common employments; *e*) at the nature and tendency of their religious performances; *f*) at the preaching they hear; *g*) at the blindness of their own hearts.]

Vers. 20-27. J. Lange:—The inner spiritual life begins with the heart. As is the heart so are all its issues; for "from the heart proceed evil thoughts," *etc.*, Matth. xv. 19; xii. 35.—*Berleb. Bible:* The heart must keep the doctrine, and the doctrine the heart. Both are so intimately connected that neither can be without the other. . . . Nature herself in the natural heart shows with what care we must keep the spiritual (ethical) heart. In this we can never be too precise, too sharp, or too careful. If we guard our house, much more must the heart be guarded; the watches must there be doubled, *etc.*—In this all the duties of a door-keeper combine, reminding us who goes in and out, what sort of thoughts enter into the heart, what sort of desires go out, *etc.* Self-denial is the best means to such a keeping of the heart. It must stand as porter before the heart's door; and the cross and the patience of Christ is the best door of the heart, well preserved with bolts and bars against all intrusion or violence.—Saurin (sermon on ver. 26):—On the needful attention which each should give to his ways.—*Calwer Handb.:*—Threefold counsel in regard to the way and means of continuing in the right path: 1) give good heed to thy heart; 2) put away a perverse mouth (ver. 24); 3) let thine eyes look straightforward (vers. 25-27).—Von Gerlach:—The first and most immediate thing proceeding from the heart is words, then deeds. Let the former be above all things truthful and sincere; the latter circumspect, well considered, and then executed with certainty and confidence (vers. 26, 27). Comp. Rom. xiv. 23; and Seneca's well known maxim: *Quod dubitas, ne feceris.*—[Arnot: We cry to God in the words of David, Create in me a clean heart, and He answers back by the mouth of David's son, Keep thy heart. Keep it with the keeping of heaven above, and of the earth beneath,—God's keeping bespoken in prayer, and man's keeping applied in watchful effort.—Ver. 27. Trapp: Keep the king's highway: keep within God's precincts, and ye keep under His protection.—Bridges: Though to keep the heart be God's work, it is man's agency. Our efforts are His instrumentality.]

Digitized by Google

8. Warning against intercourse with wanton women, and against the ruinous consequences of licentiousness.

CHAP. V. 1–23.

1 My son, give heed to my wisdom,
to my prudence incline thine ear,
2 so that thou maintain discretion,
and thy lips preserve knowledge.
3 For the lips of the strange woman distil honey,
and smoother than oil is her mouth:
4 but at last she is bitter as wormwood,
sharp as a two-edged sword.
5 Her feet go down to death,
her steps lay hold upon the lower world;
6 the path of life she never treadeth,
her steps stray, she knoweth not whither.
7 And now, ye children, hearken to me,
and depart not from the words of my mouth!
8 Turn away thy path from her,
and draw not near to the door of her house!
9 that thou mayest not give to others thine honor,
and thy years to a cruel one;
10 that strangers may not sate themselves with thy strength,
and (the fruit of) thy labor (abide) in a stranger's house,
11 and thou must groan at last
when thy body and thy flesh are consumed,
12 and say, "Why then did I hate correction
and my heart despised reproof?
13 and I did not hearken to the voice of my teachers,
did not incline mine ear to those that instructed me?
14 Well nigh had I fallen into utter destruction
in the midst of the assembly and the congregation!"
15 Drink waters from thine own cistern,
and flowing streams from thine own well spring!
16 Shall thy streams flow abroad
as water brooks in the streets?
17 Let them be thine alone,
and none belong to strangers with thee.
18 Let thy fountain be blessed,
and rejoice in the wife of thy youth,
19 the lovely hind, the graceful gazelle;
let her bosom charm thee always;
in her love delight thyself evermore.
20 Why, my son, wouldst thou be fascinated with a stranger,
and embrace the bosom of a wanton woman?
21 For before the eyes of Jehovah are the ways of man,
and all his paths He marketh out.
22 His own sins overtake him, the evil doer,
and by the cords of his sin is he held fast.
23 He will die for lack of correction,
and in the greatness of his folly will he perish.

Digitized by Google

GRAMMATICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1.—[The shortened Imperative is even more than the paragogic entitled to the first place in its clause; here הַט follows its object, Bött., § 960, *c.* ex. (comp. critical note on iv. 20).—A.]

Ver. 2.—לִשְׁמֹר. The construction in the Hebrew is the same as in chap. ii. 8; the Infinitive with לְ is followed by the finite verb. [יִנְצֹרוּ, a masc. verbal form with a fem. subject,—comp. note on iv. 10. For emphasis or euphony the assimilation of the נ is sometimes dispensed with. Bött., § 1100, 3.—A.]

Ver. 14.—[הָיִיתִי, a Perf. with the signification of a pluperf. subj.; a very little and I *should have fallen*. Comp. Bött., § 947, *d*.—A.]

Ver. 18 [Bött., § 964, 6, makes יְהִי an example of the *desponsive* use of the Jussive, and therefore makes it more than the expression of a wish (see Exeg. notes); it becomes an anticipation or promise.—A.]

Ver. 22.—[יִלְכְּדֻנוֹ, a unique example of the attachment of וֹ, a more common suffix of the Perf., to the lengthened form of the third plur. masc. of the Imperf. See Bött., §§ 881, λ,—1042, δ,—1047, ex., correcting Ewald, § 250 *b*, who makes the נ epenthetic. See also Green, § 105, *c*.—A.]

EXEGETICAL.

1. In opposition to the opinion of those who refer vers. 1-6 to the discourse of the father in ch. iv. 4 sq., consult above, p. 71. J. A. Bengel appears even to have regarded the entire fifth chapter as a continuation of that discourse, for he remarks on ver. 1, "Inasmuch as David's careful directions to Solomon bear upon unchastity, it seems likely that David and Bathsheba were concerned lest Solomon might also pursue a course like that in which the parents sinned together" (see *Beiträge zu* J. A. Bengel's *Schrifterklärung, mitgetheilt von* Dr. Osk. Waechter, Leips., 1865," p. 26). But the son addressed in the preceding chapter was conceived of as a "tender child;" the one now addressed is a young man already married, see vers. 15-19. For, as in the similar admonitions of the 6th and 7th chapters, it is not simple illicit intercourse, but such an intercourse within marriage relations, adulterous intercourse with lewd women, that constitutes the object of the admonitory representations of the teacher of wisdom.—Furthermore, as Bertheau rightly observes, the passage before us, in its substance and its form, variously reminds us of chap. ii., especially in respect to its form, by its long propositions extended through several verses (3 sq., 8 sq., 15 sq.). As the three main divisions of the discourse are of not quite equal length, we may with Hitzig distinguish the introductory paragraph, vers. 1-6; the central and chief didactic section, vers. 7-20; which again falls into two divisions, vers. 7-14 and 15-20; and the epilogue, vers. 21-23.

2. Vers. 1-6. **My son, give heed to my wisdom,** *etc.*—Quite similar are the demands which introduce the two subsequent warnings against unchastity.—Chap. vi. 20 and vii. 1.—**So that thou maintain discretion**—literally reflection, מְזִמּוֹת, which elsewhere is usually employed in a bad sense, of base deceitful proposals, but here denotes the wise prudential consideration, the circumspect demeanor of the wise; comp. the singular in ch. i. 4.—**And thy lips preserve knowledge.**—The *lips*—not precisely the heart, chap. iii. 1—are to preserve knowledge so far forth as it is of moment to retain literally the instructions of wisdom and often to repeat them.—Ver. 3. **For the lips of the strange woman distil honey.**—The "stranger" is the harlot, as in chap. iii. 16. Her lips "drop honey" (נֹפֶת, comp. Ps. xix. 11) because of the sweetness not of her kisses but of her words. Comp. the quite similar representation, Song Sol. iv. 11, and as a sample of the wanton woman's words that are sweet as honey, Prov. vii. 14 sq.—**Smoother than oil is her mouth.**—The palate (חֵךְ) as an instrument of discourse occurs also chap. viii. 7; Job vi. 30; xxxi. 30. The "smoothness" of discourse as a symbol of the flattering and seductive, chap. ii. 16; vi. 24.—Ver. 4. **But at last she is bitter**—literally "her last is bitter" (comp. xxiii. 32), *i. e.*, that which finally reveals itself as her true nature, and as the ruinous consequence of intercourse with her.—**As wormwood** (לַעֲנָה, for which the LXX inaccurately gives χολή, gall), a well known emblem of bitterness, as in Deut. xxix. 18; Jer. ix. 15; Am. v. 7; vi. 12. It is "a plant toward two feet high, belonging to the Genus *Artemisia* (Spec. *Artemisia absinthium*), which produces a very firm stalk with many branches, grayish leaves, and small, almost round, pendent blossoms. It has a bitter and saline taste, and seems to have been regarded in the East as also a poison, of which the frequent combination with רֹאשׁ gives an intimation" (Umbreit; comp. Celsius, *Hierobot.* I. 480; Oken, *Naturgesch.* III. 763 sq.).—**As a two-edged sword**—literally as a sword of mouths, a sword with more than one mouth (חֶרֶב פִּיּוֹת, comp. Ps. cxlix. 6; Judg. iii. 16). [The multiplicative plural is sometimes used thus even of objects that occur in pairs; comp. Bött., § 702, 3—A.] "The fact that the surface of the sword is also smooth is in this antithesis to the second clause of ver. 3 properly disregarded," Hitzig.—Vers. 5 and 6 explain and confirm more fully the statement of ver. 4.—**Upon the lower world her steps lay hold**—*i. e.*, they hasten straight and surely to the kingdom of the dead, the place of those dying unblessed. [The author cannot be understood as meaning that שְׁאוֹל is always and only the place of those dying *unblessed*. The passage cited, chap. i. 12, is inconsistent with this,—so is the first passage in the O. T. where the word occurs, Gen. xxxvii. 35,—so is the last passage, Hab. ii. 5,—so are many intervening passages, especially such as Ps. xvi. 10; Eccles. ix. 10. If the word here has this intensive meaning, it must

Digitized by Google

appear from the connection. See, therefore, חַיִּים in ver. 6, which plainly has a moral import Comp. FUERST's *Handw.*—A.] Comp. ii. 18; vii. 27,—and on שְׁאוֹל, Hades, the lower world, i. 12.—**The path of life she never treadeth.**—The verb פלס, here just as in iv. 26, means to measure off (not to "consider," as BERTHEAU maintains), to travel over. The particle פֶּן, *ne forte*, stands here, as in Job xxxii. 18, "independent of any preceding proposition, and in accordance with its etymology signifies substantially 'God forbid that,' *etc.*, or 'there is no danger that,'" *etc.*, HITZIG; it is therefore equivalent to "surely not, nevermore." ABEN EZRA, COCCEIUS, C. B. MICHAELIS and others regard תְּפַלֵּס as second pers. masc.; "*viam vitæ ne forte expendas, vagantur orbitæ ejus*" ["lest perchance thou shouldst ponder the way of life, her paths wander;" which is very nearly the language of the E. V.]. But the second clause shows that the wanton woman must be the subject of the verb. BERTHEAU's translation is however also too hard and forced, according to which the first clause is dependent upon the second, but it is to be regarded as a negative final clause prefixed; "that she may not ponder (!) the path of life, her paths have become devious," *etc.* [This is the view adopted by HOLDEN, STUART, WORDSWORTH, and DE WETTE; KAMPH. has the same conception of the relation of the clauses, but prefers the verb *einschlagen*, adopt or enter—A.] The LXX, Vulg. and other ancient versions already contain the more correct interpretation, regarding פֶּן as here essentially equivalent to לֹא; only that the emphatic intensifying of the negation should not be overlooked.—[FUERST (*Handw.*) is also decidedly of this opinion; he renders "*dass ja nicht*"=*so that by no means;* he explains the idiom as representing a necessary consequence as an object contemplated.—A.]—**Her steps stray, she knoweth not whither.**—נָעוּ is here doubtless not intended as an inceptive ("they fall to staggering"), nor in general does it design to express a "staggering of the tracks or paths," a figure in itself inappropriate. It probably signifies rather a roving, an uncertain departure from the way (*vagi gressus*, Vulg.); and the לֹא תֵדָע which is connected with it is not to be explained by "she marks it not, without her perceiving it, unawares" (as it is usually taken, after the analogy of Job ix. 5; Ps. xxxv. 8) [so by NOYES, STUART, MUENSCH.; while the E. V. follows the old error of making the verb a second person.—A.], but by "she knows not whither," as an accusative of direction subordinated to the foregoing idea (HITZIG, DE WETTE).

2. Vers. 7-14. **And now, ye children, hearken to me.**—וְעַתָּה draws an inference from what precedes, and introduces the following admonition; comp vii. 24. The "words of my mouth" are the specific words contained in ver. 8 sq.—Ver. 9. **That thou mayest not give thine honor to others**—*i. e.*, as an adulterer, who is apprehended and exposed to public disgrace.—**And thy years to a cruel one**—*i. e.*, to the injured husband, who will punish the paramour of his faithless wife with merciless severity, perchance sell him as a slave, or even take his life. [This explanation is grammatically better than that (of HOLDEN, *e. g.*) which makes the "cruel one" the adulteress, and more direct than that (of STUART and others) which makes him the purchaser of the punished adulterer.—A.]. Comp. vi. 34, and below, ver. 14 —Ver. 10. **That strangers may not sate themselves with thy strength.**—כֹּחַ might, strength, is here undoubtedly equivalent to property, possessions, as the parallel עֲצָבֶיךָ, thy toils, *i. e.*, what thou hast laboriously acquired, the fruit of thy bitter sweat (Vulg. *laboris tui*), plainly indicates. The idea is here plainly this, that the foolish paramour will be plundered through the avaricious demands of the adulterous woman (comp. vi. 26), and that thus his possessions will gradually pass over into other hands (Ecclesiast. ix. 6). A different explanation is given by EWALD, BERTHEAU, ELSTER (in general also by UMBREIT); that the proper penalty for adultery was according to Lev. xx. 10; Deut. xxii. 22 sq.; John viii. 5, stoning; in case, however, the injured husband had been somewhat appeased, the death penalty was on the ground of a private agreement changed into that of a personal ownership, the entrance into the disgracefully humiliating condition of servitude, and that allusion is here made to this last contingency. But while the superficial meaning of vers. 9 and 10 could be reconciled with this assumption, yet there is nothing whatsoever known of any such custom, of transmuting the death prescribed in the law for the adulterer by a compromise into his sale as a slave; and as the entire assumption is besides complicated with considerable subjective difficulties (see HITZIG on this passage). the above explanation is to be preferred as the simpler and more obvious.—Ver. 11. **And thou must needs groan at last**—literally "at thine end," *i. e.*, when thou hast done, when all is over with thee. נָהַם used of the loud groaning of the poor and distressed also in Ez. xxiv. 28; comp. Prov. xix. 12; xx. 2; xxviii. 15, where the same word describes the roaring of the lion. The LXX (*καὶ μεταμεληθήσῃ*) appear to have read וְנִחַמְתָּ a gloss containing a true explanation, but needlessly weakening the genuine sense of the word.—**When thy body and flesh are consumed.** בְּשָׂרְךָ וּשְׁאֵרֶךָ, *i. e.*, plainly *thy whole body;* the two synonymes, the first of which describes the flesh with the frame, and the second the flesh in the strictest sense, without the bones, are designed to emphasize the idea of the body in its totality, and that with the intention of marking "the utter destruction of the libertine" (UMBREIT).—Ver. 12. **Why did I then hate correction?**—Literally, How did I then hate correction? *i. e.*, in what an inexcusable way? How could I then so hate correction?—Ver. 14. **A little more, and I had fallen into utter destruction**—*i. e.*, how narrowly did I escape a fall into the extremest ruin, literally, "into entireness of misery, into completeness of destruction!" As the second clause shows, the allusion is to the danger of condemnation before

Digitized by Google

the assembled congregation, and of execution by stoning; see above on ver. 10.—**Assembly and congregation**—Hebrew קָהָל and עֵדָה—stand in the relation of the convened council of the elders acting as judges (Deut. xxxiii. 4, 5), and the concourse of the people executing the condemning sentence (Numb. xv. 35; comp. Ps. vii. 7). For קָהָל is in general always a convened assembly, *convocatio;* עֵדָה on the contrary is a multitude of the people gathering without any special call, *coetus sive multitudo.*

4. Vers. 15-20. To the detailed warning set forth in vers. 8-14 there is now added a corresponding positive antithesis, a not less appropriate admonition to conjugal fidelity and purity.—**Drink waters out of thine own cistern,** *etc.*, *i. e.*, seek the satisfaction of love's desire simply and alone with thine own wife. "The wife is appropriately compared with a fountain not merely inasmuch as offspring are born of her, but also since she satisfies the desire of the man. In connection with this we must call to mind, in order to feel the full power of the figure, how in antiquity and especially in the East the possession of a spring was regarded a great and even sacred thing. Thus the mother Sarah is compared to a well spring, Is. li. 1, and Judah, the patriarch, is spoken of as 'waters,' Is. xlviii. 1; as also Israel, Num. xxiv. 7; Ps. lxviii. 26" (Umbreit). Compare also Song Sol. iv. 12.—**And flowing streams from thine own well spring**—With בּוֹר, *i. e.*, properly "cistern," an artificially prepared reservoir, there is associated in the second clause בְּאֵר, fountain, *i. e.*, a natural spring of water conducted to a particular fountain or well spring. Only such a natural fountainhead (comp. Gen. xxvi. 15–20) can pour forth נֹזְלִים, *i. e.*, purling waters, living, fresh, cool water for drinking (Song Sol. iv. 15; Jer. xviii. 14).—Ver. 16. **Shall thy streams flow abroad as water brooks in the streets?**—To supply פֶּן (Gesenius, Umbreit) or אַל (Ewald, Bertheau, Elster [Stuart], *etc.*) is needless, if the verse be conceived of as interrogative, which, like Prov. vi. 30; Ps. lvi. 7 sq., is indicated as such only by the interrogative tone. So with unquestionable correctness Hitzig. A purely affirmative conception of the sentence, according to which it is viewed as representing the blessing of children born of this lawful conjugal love under the figure of a stream overflowing and widely extending (Schultens, Döderlein, Von Hofmann, *Schriftbew.*, II., 2, 375 [Holden, Noyes, Muenscher, Wordsw.], *etc.*) would seriously break the connection with ver. 17. As to the subject, *i. e.*, the description of a wife who has proved false to her husband and runs after other men, comp. especially chap. vii. 12.—Ver. 18. **Let thy fountain be blessed.**—יְהִי "attaches itself formally to the jussive יִהְיוּ of the preceding verse" (Hitzig), and so adds to the wish that conjugal fidelity may prevail between the married pair, the further wish that prosperity and blessing may attend their union. בָּרוּךְ doubtless used of substantial blessings, *i. e.*, of the prosperity and joy which the husband is to prepare for his wife, as an instrument in the favoring hand of God. This, which is Hitzig's view, the connection with the second clause recommends above that of Umbreit, which explains בָּרוּךְ as here meaning "extolled," and also above that of Bertheau, which contemplates "children as the blessing of marriage."—**And rejoice with the wife of thy youth.**—Comp. Deut. xxiv. 5; Eccles. ix. 9. "Wife of thy youth," *i. e.*, wife to whom thou hast given the fair bloom of thy youth (Umbreit). Compare the expression "companion of youth" in ii. 17. In a needlessly artificial way Ewald and Bertheau have regarded the entire eighteenth verse as a final clause depending on the second member of ver. 17: "that thy fountain may be blessed, and thou mayest have joy," *etc.* Hitzig rightly observes that to give this meaning we should have expected וִיהִי instead of יְהִי, and likewise וְשִׂמְחַתָּ instead of וּשְׂמַח, and that in general ver. 18 does not clearly appear to be a final clause. [Stuart makes the second clause final, depending on the first, which is also unnecessarily involved.]—Ver. 19. **The lovely hind, the graceful gazelle.**—Fitly chosen images to illustrate the graceful, lively, fascinating nature of a young wife; comp. the name "gazelle" (צְבִי, Ταβιθά and its equivalent Δορκάς as a woman's proper name; Acts ix. 36; also Song Sol. ii. 9, 17; viii. 14. Umbreit refers to numerous parallels from Arabic and Persian poets, which show the popularity of this figure in Oriental literature. ["These pretty animals are amiable, affectionate and loving by universal testimony—and no sweeter comparison can be found." Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, I., 252—A.]—**Let her bosom charm thee always.**—Instead of דַּדֶּיהָ, her breasts, the *Versio Veneta* reads דֹּדֶיהָ her love (*αἱ ταύτης φιλίαι*), which reading Hitzig prefers ("*ihre Minne*"). A needless alteration and weakening of the meaning, in accordance with Song Sol. i. 2; Prov. vii. 18, as rendered by the LXX. Comp. rather the remarks below on ver. 20.—**In her love delight thyself evermore.** שָׁגָה elsewhere used of the staggering gait of the intoxicated (chap. xx. 1; Isa. xxviii. 7), here by a bold trope used of the ecstatic joy of a lover. That the same word is employed in the next verse for the description of the foolish delirium of the libertine hastening after the harlot, and again in ver. 23 of the exhausted prostration of the morally and physically ruined transgressor,—and is therefore used in each instance with a somewhat modified meaning, indicates plainly a definite purpose. The threefold use of שָׁגָה is intended to constitute a climax, to illustrate the sad consequences of sins of unchastity.—Ver. 20. Emphatic sequel to the foregoing, concisely and vigorously summing up the admonitory and warning contents of vers. 8-19. **And embrace the bosom of a wanton woman.** This expression (תְּחַבֵּק חֵק) testifies to the correctness of the reading דַּדֶּיהָ in ver. 19.

5. Vers. 21-23. Epilogue for the monitory presentation of the truth that no one is in condition

Digitized by Google

to conceal his adultery, be it ever so secretly practiced,—that on the contrary God sees this with every other transgression, and punishes it with the merited destruction of the sinner.—**For before Jehovah's eyes are the ways of man, and all his paths He marketh.**—(פלס here also not to "ponder," but to "mark out," see note on ver. 6.) An important proof text not merely for God's omniscience, but also for His special providence and "*concursus*" [coöperation in human conduct]. Comp. Job xxxiv. 21; xxiv. 23; xxxi. 4, *etc.*—Ver. 22. **His sins overtake him, the evil doer.** The double designation of the object, by the suffix in ילכדנו and then by the expression "the evil doer," added for emphasis, gives a peculiar force. Comp. xiv. 13; Ezek. xvi. 8; Jer. ix. 25.—**By the cords of his sin.** Comp. Isa. v. 18, and in general, for the sentiment of the whole verse, chap. i. 31, 32; xi. 5; xviii. 7; xxix. 6; Ps. vii. 15; xl. 12; John viii. 34; 2 Pet. ii. 19.—Ver. 23. **For lack of correction.** This is undoubtedly the explanation of באין מוסר, and not "without correction" (Umbreit). The ב is not circumstantial, but causal (instrumental), as in the 2d member.—As to the meaning of שגה see above, remarks on ver. 19.

DOCTRINAL, ETHICAL, AND HOMILETIC.

That our chapter holds up in opposition to all unregulated gratification of the sexual impulses, the blessing of conjugal fidelity and chastity, requires no detailed proof. It is a chapter on a *pious marriage relation*, appropriately attached to the preceding, on the right training of children; for pious and strict discipline of children is impossible, where the sacred bonds of marriage are disregarded, violated and trampled under foot. In conformity with the thoroughly practical nature of the doctrine of wisdom (the Hhokmah), the author, as vers. 15-20 show, completely overthrows all the demands and suggestions of a sensual desire that has broken over all the sacred bounds prescribed by God, and so, as it were, has become wild and insane, by exhibiting the satisfaction of the sexual impulse *in marriage* as justified and in conformity with the divine rule. An important hint for a practical estimate of the contents of this chapter, from which evidently there may be drawn not merely material and arguments for a thorough treatment of the Christian doctrine with respect to the sixth commandment in general, but specially for the exhibition of the true evangelical idea of marriage, in contrast with the extravagant asceticism of Romish theology, and also of many sects both of ancient and modern times (Montanists, Eustathians, Cathari, Gichtelites, *etc.*). In this connection 1 Cor. vii. must also, naturally, be brought into the account, especially the 5th verse of this chapter, which exhibits the fundamental idea of vers. 15-20 of our section, reduced to the briefest and most concise form that is possible; with the addition of the needful corrective, and the explanation that is appropriate in connection with the "always" and "evermore" of ver. 19, which might possibly be misunderstood.

As a *homily*, therefore, *on the entire chapter*: On the right keeping of the 6th commandment, a) through the avoidance of all unchastity; b) through the maintenance of a faithful (vers. 15-20) and devout (vers. 21-23) demeanor in the sacred marriage relation.—Melanchthon: The sum of the matter is: Love truly thine own wife, and be content with her alone, as this law of marriage was at once ordained in Paradise (Gen. ii.): "they shall be one flesh," *i. e.*, one male and one female united inseparably. For then also, even if human nature had remained incorrupt, God would have wished men to comprehend purity, and to maintain the exercise of obedience by observing this order, *viz.*, by avoiding all wandering desires. Comp. Augustine: Marriage before the fall was ordained for duty, after the fall for a remedy.

Vers. 1-4. Egard:—A harlot is the devil's decoy, and becomes to many a tree of death unto death. The fleshly and the spiritual harlot most fill hell (chap. vii. 27). The devil comes first with sweetness and friendliness, to betray man, afterward however with bitterness, to destroy the soul.—[Ver. 8. Trapp: There is no such pleasure as to have overcome an offered pleasure; neither is there any greater conquest than that that is gotten over a man's corruptions.]—Starke: Beware of the spiritual antichristian harlot, who tempts the whole world to idolatry, and to forsaking the true God (1 John v. 21).—There are in general many allegorical interpretations in the old writers, in which the strange, lascivious woman is either partially or outright assumed (as, *e. g.*, more recently in the *Berleb. Bible*) to be the designation of "the false church," of antichrist, of worldly wisdom, *etc.* [See also Wordsw. *in loc.*, and also on ver. 19, together with his citations from Bede, *etc.* —A.]. For Evangelical preaching, naturally, only a treatment that is partially allegorical, can be regarded admissible, and in the end expedient; such a treatment as consists in a generalization of the specific prohibition of unchastity into a warning against spiritual licentiousness or idolatry in general.

Ver. 15-23. Starke: An admonition to hold to one's own wife only; 1) the admonition (15-17); 2) the motives: a) the blessing on such conjugal fidelity (18, 19); b) the dishonor (20, 21) and c) the ruinous result of conjugal unfaithfulness (22, 23).—[Ver. 15. Arnot: God condescends to bring His own institute forward in rivalry with the deceitful pleasures of sin. All the accessories of the family are the Father's gift, and He expects us to observe and value them.—H. Smith (quoted by Bridges): First choose thy love; then love thy choice.]—Egard: A married life full of true love, joy and peace, is a paradise on earth; on the other hand, a marriage full of hate, unfaithfulness and strife is a real hell.—Von Gerlach: The loveliness and enjoyment of a happy domestic relation as the earthly motive, the holy ordinance of matrimony watched over by God with omniscient strictness, as the higher motive to chastity.—*Calwer Handbuch:* Be true to thine own wife; therein is happiness! Sin against her, and thou becomest through thine own fault wretched!—[Ver. 21. Trapp: A man that is about any evil should

Digitized by Google

stand in awe of himself; how much more of God!—ARNOT: Secrecy is the study and hope of the wicked. A sinner's chief labor is to hide his sin; and his labor is all lost. Sin becomes the instrument of punishing sinners—retribution in the system of nature, set in motion by the act of sin].

---

9. Warning against inconsiderate suretyship.

CHAP. VI. 1–5.

1 My son, if thou hast become surety for thy neighbor,
hast given thine hand to a stranger;
2 if thou art entangled through the words of thy mouth,
art snared by the words of thy mouth:
3 then do this, my son, and free thyself,
since thou hast come into the hand of thy neighbor:
go, bestir thyself, and importune thy neighbor!
4 Give no sleep to thine eyes,
nor slumber to thine eyelids;
5 free thyself, like a roe, from his hand,
and like a bird from the hand of the fowler.

10. Rebuke of the sluggard.

CHAP. VI. 6–11.

6 Go to the ant thou sluggard;
consider her ways and be wise!
7 which hath no governor,
director, or ruler;
8 (yet) she prepareth in summer her food,
she gathereth in harvest her store!
9 How long wilt thou lie, O sluggard?
when wilt thou rise from thy sleep?
10 "A little sleep, a little slumber,
a little folding of the hands to rest;"—
11 then cometh thy poverty like a robber,
and thy want as an armed man!

11. Warning against deceit and violent dealing.

CHAP. VI. 12-19.

12 A worthless creature is the deceiver,
he that walketh in perverseness of speech;
13 he who winketh with his eye, who speaketh with his foot,
who hinteth with his finger.
14 Perverseness is in his heart,
he deviseth evil at all times;
he stirreth up strifes.
15 Therefore suddenly shall his destruction come,
in a moment shall he be destroyed, and there is no remedy.
16 These six things Jehovah hateth,
and seven are an abhorrence of his soul;
17 haughty eyes, a lying tongue,
and hands that shed innocent blood;

Digitized by Google

18 a heart that deviseth evil plots,
feet that make haste to run to evil;
19 one that uttereth lies as a false witness,
and one that stirreth up strifes between brethren.

12. Admonition to chastity with a warning delineation of the fearful consequences of adultery.

CHAP. VI. 20–35.

20 Keep, O my son, thy father's commandment,
and reject not the law of thy mother:
21 bind them to thy heart evermore,
fasten it about thy neck.
22 When thou walkest let it guide thee,
when thou liest down let it guard thee,
and at thy waking let it talk with thee.
23 For a lamp is the commandment, and the law a light,
and the reproofs of corrections are a way of life;
24 to keep thee from the vile woman,
from the flattering tongue of the strange woman.—
25 Long not for her beauty in thy heart,
and let her not catch thee with her eyelids!
26 For for the sake of a harlot one cometh to a loaf of bread,
and a man's wife lieth in wait for the precious life.
27 May one take fire in his bosom,
and his clothes not be burned?
28 Or may one walk upon coals,
and his feet not be scorched?
29 So he who goeth to his neighbor's wife;
no one that toucheth her shall be unpunished.
30 Men do not overlook the thief, when he stealeth
to satisfy his craving when he is hungry;
31 if he be found he must restore seven fold,
the whole wealth of his house must he give.
32 He who committeth adultery is beside himself;
he that destroyeth himself doeth such things.
33 Stripes and disgrace doth he find,
and his reproach will not pass away.
34 For jealousy is man's fierce anger,
and he spareth not in the day of vengeance.
35 He regardeth not any ransom,
and is not willing if thou increase thy gift.

GRAMMATICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 1, 3. The form רֵעֶ֑יךָ, which is found in some texts, is not a plural, but the ֶי "indicates in pause the pronunciation with ֶ as in Gen. xvi. 5; Ps. ix. 15," HITZIG. Many MSS., moreover, exhibit here the regular form רֵעֶ֑ךָ [BÖTTCHER, § 888, n. 2, utterly rejects the possibility that רֵעֶ֑יךָ can be a singular form, and also that the plural form is admissible here. HOLDEN's rendering "thy friends," is incorrectly based upon the plural reading.—A.].

Ver. 8. [Note the appropriate change of tense. The future תָּכִין, "*Fiens solitum*," BÖTT. § 943, *b*, and the perf. אָגְרָה, "*Perfectum effectivum*," §§ 940, 4; 950, 4; the continually recurring "preparation," the ensured "gathering."—A.]

Ver. 12. הֹלֵךְ stands here with the simple accusative without בְּ, as in Mic. ii. 11; Is. xxxiii. 15; Ps. xv. 2.

Ver. 13. [קֹרֵץ used here alone with בְּ, usually with a direct object. מֹולֵל; the verb is in use only in Piel. For the occurrence of participial forms in Piel thus resembling Kal, see FUERST (sub. v. מָלַל), and BÖTT. § 994, 4.—A.].

Ver. 14. For the explanation of the K'ri מִדְיָנִים (instead of the K'thibh מְדָנִים) see HITZIG on this passage, who is probably right in referring to Gen. xxxvii. 36 as the source and occasion of this substitution.

Ver. 16. [The fem. הֵנָּה used of that which is distinctly neuter. See BÖTT. § 862, 4.—A.].

Ver. 19. The יָפִיחַ can be regarded as a relative Imperf., with which the participle מְשַׁלֵּחַ interchanges, or it may be regarded as an irregular participial form, lengthened from יָפֵחַ Ps. xxvii. 12, and formed like יָצִיא, גָּמִיל, etc.

(So HITZIG explains the form) [FUERST regards it an Imperf., but BÖTT., very decidedly as a Hiph. participial, here and in xii. 17; xiv. 25; xix. 5, 9; Ps. xii. 6; xxvii. 12. See § 994, 9.—A.].

Ver. 21. [קָשְׁרֵם, a masc. suffix referring to fem. nouns. BÖTT. § 877, 3, declares it characteristic of "secular prose, popular poetry, and the majority of the later Hebrew writers" thus to disregard exactness in the use of the suffix pronouns. Chap. xx. 12 is the only similar example adduced from Proverbs. Comp. GREEN, § 104, *g*.—A.].

Ver. 32. מַשְׁחִית a future participle. The suffix in יַעֲשֶׂנָּה refers to the נְאֻפִים which is readily supplied from the נֹאֵף אִשָּׁה of the first member. [Interpretations divide as to the subject and predicate clause of the sentence. MUENSCHER, NOYES, HOLDEN agree with the E. V. in making destruction the predicted fate of the adulterer; STUART, KAMPH., and DE W. agree with our author in making adultery the natural and certain course of the self-destroyer.—A.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. The sixth chapter consists of four independent admonitory discourses of unequal length, of quite different contents, and a merely external and circumstantial connection (through points of contact, as between "sleep and slumber" in ver. 4 and the same expressions in ver. 10; through the triple warning against impoverishment: vers. 11, 15 and 26, *etc.*). This is as apparent as is the fact that it is only in the last of these four sections that the subject of adultery, that was treated in the fifth chapter, is resumed. It is nevertheless arbitrary and lacks all clear proof, when HITZIG declares the three preceding sections to be the addition of an interpolator different from the author of chaps. i.–ix., who is supposed to have taken them from some old book of proverbs, and to have enlarged the third by adding vers. 16–19. For, it is argued, this numerical group of proverbs, of eight members, clearly shows itself to be the personal production of the interpolator, who was led by the sixfold division of the categories in vers. 12–14 to the composition of this group of the six things that the Lord hates. As though this parallel sixfold or rather sevenfold arrangement in vers. 12–19 could not be the work of the composer of the entire group of proverbial discourses that lies before us, just as in the series of similar numerical proverbs contained in chap. xxx. (comp. Introd. § 14)! And still further, as if there had not been already in what has gone before at least one isolated warning against unchastity and adultery, as a demonstration of the fact, that in this connection also the advisory and admonitory discourses that relate to this matter (chap. v. 1 sq.; vi. 20 sq.; vii. 1 sq.), must not necessarily form a whole continuing without interruption, but might very naturally be interspersed with other shorter passages of differing contents, like those forming the first half of chap. vi.!—Apart from this, HITZIG is undoubtedly correct in judging, that attention should be called to the close connection of vers. 16–19 with vers. 12–15, and that the first mentioned group should be regarded as a mere continuation and fuller expansion of the import of the last mentioned. A special argument for this is the literal repetition of the expression, "stir up strifes," from ver. 14 in ver. 19. The view recently prevalent (see *e. g.*, UMBREIT, BERTHEAU, ELSTER on this passage), according to which vers. 16–19 form a separate group of verses as really independent as the rest (1-5, 6-11, *etc.*) is to be estimated by what has been already said. The correct division has been before presented by DELITZSCH (HERZOG'S *Real. Encycl.* XIV., 698), and also by EWALD (on this passage).

2. Vers. 1-5. Warning against suretyship.—**My son, if thou hast become surety for thy neighbor.**—The frequent warnings which our book contains against giving security for others (comp. in addition xi. 15; xvii. 18; xx. 16; xxii. 26), are to be explained doubtless by the severe treatment, which, in accordance with the old Hebrew jurisprudence, was awarded to sureties; for their goods might be distrained or they even sold as slaves, just as in the case of insolvent debtors (2 Kings iv. 1; Matth. xviii. 25; comp. Ecclesiast. viii. 13; xxix. 18-25, and also the warning maxim of the Greek philosopher THALES: "ἐγγύα, πάρα δ'ἄτα" [give surety, and ruin is near], and the modern popular proverb "*Bürgen soll man würgen*" [the alliteration cannot be translated; an approach can be made to it in "worry a surety"].—In the passage before us the warning is not so much against suretyship in general, as merely against the imprudent assumption of such obligations, leaving out of account the moral unreliableness of the man involved; and the counsel is to the quickest possible release from every obligation of this kind that may have been hastily assumed.—**Hast given thine hand to a stranger.**—The stranger (זָר) is not the creditor, but the debtor, who in the first clause had been designated as "neighbor." For according to Job xvii. 3 the surety gave his hand to the debtor as a sign that he became bound for him. Therefore the translation of EWALD and ELSTER, "for a stranger," is unnecessary as it is incorrect.—Ver. 2. **If thou art entangled through the words of thy mouth.**—This second half of the protasis, which, according to Hebrew idiom, is still dependent on the "if" of ver. 1, refers to the involved and embarrassed condition of the surety some time after his inconsiderate giving of bonds.—Ver. 3. **Then do this, my son,** *etc.*—The apodosis, with its emphatic warning (which extends through ver. 5), is fitly introduced by the intensive particle אֵפוֹא, now, now therefore. Comp. Job xvii. 15; Gen. xxvii. 32; xliii. 11.—**Since thou hast come into the hand of thy neighbor.** HITZIG, interpreting the כִּי, as in ii. 10, as equivalent to אִם, translates "if thou hast come," *etc.* But the introduction of a reason is here more pertinent, since the case of an unfortunate issue to the suretyship had already been assumed in ver. 2.—**Stamp with the foot.**—This meaning of הִתְרַפֵּס, which is attested also by Ps. lxviii. 30, is urgently commended by the following, "importune thy neighbor" (רְהַב רֵעֶיךָ). [In our version of this phrase in its connection we have substituted FUERST'S interpretation which is also HOLDEN'S. The verb is found only here and in Ps. lxviii. 30. GESENIUS and many others, start-

Digitized by Google

ing with the radical idea, "to trample," which they find in רפשׂ and assume in רפס, translate the Hithp. in both passages, "suffer thyself to be trampled," *i. e.*, "prostrate thyself." [So the E. V., DE W., M., N. and ST.]. HUPFELD (see Comm. on Ps. lxviii. 31) and others adopt the indirect reflexive as the true meaning,—"prostrate before thyself, *i. e.*, subdue." FUERST, distinguishing the two verbs, interprets רפס as meaning, in accordance with many Arabic analogies, "to move, stir, hasten," and the Hithp. as meaning "*sich beeilen, sich sputen*," *i. e.*, in the Imperative, make haste, bestir thyself. Although this rendering has not in its favor the weight of authorities, the internal evidence appears to us to be decidedly for it.—A.] The meaning is that one should in every way force the heedless debtor—for it is he, and not possibly the creditor, that is here again intended by the "neighbor"—to the fulfilment of his obligations, before it is too late, *i. e.*, before the matter comes to the distraint of goods or other judicial processes on the part of the creditor.—Ver. 5. **Free thyself as a roe from his hand, and like a bird,** *etc.*—Gazelle and bird—in the original a paronomasia: צְבִי and צִפּוֹר—are appropriate emblems of a captive seeking its freedom with anxious haste and exertion. The way is already prepared for these figures by the expressions employed in ver. 2. Instead of, מִיַּד "out of the hand," all the old versions, except the Vulg. and Venet., had the reading מִפַּח, "out of the snare." But this is an attempt at rhetorical improvement (perhaps according to the analogy of Ps. xci. 3), "in which it was overlooked, that the hand was introduced the first as well as the second time with a reference to the giving of the hand on becoming security" (ver. 1). Comp. UMBREIT and HITZIG on this passage.

3. Vers. 6-11. **Go to the ant, thou sluggard.**—The ant, ever working of its own impulse quietly and unweariedly, is proverbial as an emblem of industry, both among Orientals and in the West: comp. MEIDANI'S *Arabic Proverbs*, III., 468; SAADI'S Persian fable of the ant and the nightingale; ARISTOTLE'S *Historia Anim.*, 9, 26; VIRGIL'S *Georg.*, I., 186 sq.; HORACE, *Serm.*, I., 1, 33; also the German word "*ämsig*" (Old High Germ. *emazic*), which is derived from "*Ameise*" (WEIGAND, *deutsches Wörterb.*, I., 35). [See THOMSON'S *Land and Book*, I., 519, 520, for illustrations both of the diligence of the ant and the utter laziness of Oriental laborers, "which have no governor, director, or ruler."—A.]—Ver. 7. **Which hath no governor, director or ruler.**—The three expressions קָצִין, שֹׁטֵר and מֹשֵׁל are relatively like the Arabic official titles, "Kadi," "Wali," and "Emir." The שֹׁטֵר in particular is the manager, the overseer, who, *e. g.*, in connection with public works urges on to labor (Ex. v. 6, 14 sq.).—Furthermore, compare chap. xxx. 27, where also the first clause of ver. 8 recurs, in almost literal agreement with our passage.

Vers. 9-11 add to the positive admonition to industry an emphatic warning against the evil consequences of its opposite. — **How long wilt thou lie, O sluggard?**—Literally: till when wilt thou, *etc.* The עַד־מָתַי of the first clause and מָתַי of the second stand in the same order as in Nehem. ii. 6. The meaning of the two parallel questions is substantially "Wilt thou continue lying forever?—Wilt thou never rise?" The double question is, as it were, a logical protasis to the apodosis which follows in ver. 11 after the interposing of the sluggard's answer (ver. 10): "then cometh (Heb. וּבָא) like a robber," *etc.* Comp. BERTHEAU on this passage.—**A little sleep,** *etc.*—Ironical imitation of the language of the lazy man; literally repeated in chap. xxiv. 33.—**A little folding of the hands**—*i. e.*, a little folding of the arms, a well-known attitude of one who is settling himself down to sleep (comp. Eccl. iv. 5), and who in that act does just the opposite of that for which the hands and arms are naturally designed, that is, for vigorous work.—**Then cometh thy poverty like a robber.**—מְהַלֵּךְ strictly *grassator*, a frequenter of the roads, a highwayman, a footpad (LXX: κακὸς ὁδοιπορος). The parallel passage, xxiv. 34, has the Hithp. participle מִתְהַלֵּךְ without כְּ, which gives the far weaker sense: "then cometh *quietly* thy poverty."—**As an armed man**—lit., as one armed with a shield (אִישׁ מָגֵן); for even the assailing robber, since he must necessarily be prepared for resistance, must carry with weapons of offence the means of defence.

4. Vers. 12-19. **Against the deceitful and violent.**—Concerning the relation of the two divisions of this group of verses, the first of which (vers. 12-15) depicts the seven modes of deceitful action, while the second (vers. 16-19) expressly designates them a seven hated by God, repeating also their enumeration,—see above, § 1 of these exegetical comments.—**A worthless man is the deceiver.**—In support of this construction of אִישׁ אָוֶן as the subject and of the prefixed אָדָם בְּלִיַּעַל as the predicate [a construction preferred also by NOYES, KAMPH. *etc.*] we have, besides the arrangement, especially the substitution of אָדָם בְּ׳ for אִישׁ בְּ׳, which was rather to have been expected according to the analogy of 2 Sam. xvi. 7, *etc.* If the second expression were only "an intensive appositive to the first" (BERTHEAU; see also LUTHER [WORDSW., M., ST., H., in agreement with the E. V.]: "a heedless man, a mischievous person"), then we should have looked for אִישׁ in both instances. With אִישׁ אָוֶן, "man of deceit, of falsity, of inward untruth and vileness," comp. furthermore מְתֵי אָוֶן, Job xxii. 15; and also, below, ver. 18.—**He that walketh in perverseness of speech.**—Comp. iv. 24; xxviii. 18.—Ver. 13. The three participles of this verse are best understood, with HITZIG, as prefixed appositives to the subject contained in בְּלִבּוֹ, ver. 14, which is indeed the same as that of the 12th verse.—**Who winketh with his eyes.**—Comp. x. 10; Ps. xxxv. 19.—**Who speaketh with his feet**—*i. e.*, gives signs in mysterious ways (LXX: σημαίνει), now with one foot, then with the other.—**Who hinteth with**

Digitized by Google

his fingers.—מוֹרֶה Hiph. part. from ירה, here used in its most primitive meaning. The evil intent involved in the three forms of the language of signs as here enumerated is of course implied. —Ver. 14. **He deviseth evil at all times.**—Comp. iii. 29.—**He stirreth up strife.**—Literally "he lets loose contentions" (HITZIG), or "he throws out matters of dispute" (BERTHEAU); comp. ver. 19 and chap. xvi. 28.—Ver. 15. **Therefore suddenly shall his destruction come.**—Comp. i. 17; iii. 25; xxiv. 22.—**Quickly will he be destroyed,** *etc.*—Comp. xxix. 1; Is. i. 28; xxx. 14; Jer. xix. 11.—**Without remedy.**—Comp. iv. 22.

Ver. 16. **These six things Jehovah hateth, and seven,** *etc.*—Of the origin of this peculiar proverbial form, using symbolical numbers, a form for which Arabic and Persian gnomic literature supply numerous illustrations (comp. UMBREIT on this passage), ELSTER probably gives the simplest and most correct explanation, deriving it "purely from the exigencies of parallelism." "The form of parallelism could not, on account of harmony, be sacrificed in any verse. But how should a parallel be found for a number? Since it was not any definite number that was the important thing, relief was found by taking one of the next adjacent numbers as the parallel to that which was chiefly in mind." In a similar way HITZIG on Amos i. 3 (where the numbers put into this relation are three and four); "To the number three the number four is appended to characterize the first as one optionally taken, to convey the idea that *there are not understood to be precisely three and no more, but possibly more.*" At any rate, those expositors are in the wrong, who, as *e. g.*, recently BERTHEAU and VON GERLACH, find the design of this mode of numeration in the fact that the last of the enumerated elements, the seventh vice therefore in the case before us, is to be brought out with especial emphasis. [STANLEY (*Hist. Jewish Church*, II. p. 258), adduces this as a probable example of the "enigmas" or "riddles," which were one of the most characteristic embodiments of the wisdom of the wise king.—ARNOT: There is one parallel well worthy of notice between the seven cursed things here, and the seven blessed things in the fifth chapter of Matthew. The first and last of the seven are identical in the two lists. "The Lord hates a proud look" is precisely equivalent to "blessed are the poor in spirit;" and "he that soweth discord among brethren" is the exact converse of the "peacemaker."—A.].—Ver. 17. **Haughty eyes**: literally, high or lofty eyes; comp. xxx. 13; Ps. xviii. 27; cxxxi. 1; Job xxi. 22; xl. 11; also the Latin expression *grande supercilium.*—**Hands that shed innocent blood.** Comp. i. 11 sq., and Isa. lix. 7, with which passage ver. 18 also corresponds in the form of expression, without for that reason being necessarily derived from it, as HITZIG holds. For in case of such derivation the order of words ought to correspond more exactly with the alleged original, as in Rom. iii. 15-17.—Ver. 19. **One that uttereth lies as a false witness,** literally, one that breathes lies. The same characterization of the false witness is found also in chap. xiv. 5, 25; xix. 5, 9. As respects the arrangement in which the seven manifestations of treacherous dealing are enumerated in these verses, it does not perfectly correspond with the order observed in ver. 12-14. There the series is mouth, eyes, feet, fingers, heart, devising evil counsels, stirring up strifes; here it is eyes, tongue, hands, heart, feet, speaking lies, instigating strife. With reference to the organs which are named as the instruments in the first five forms of treacherous wickedness, in the second enumeration an order is adopted involving a regular descent (ver. 16-19, eyes, tongue, hands, *etc.*); the base disposition to stir up strife, or to let loose controversy (see rem. on ver. 14) in both cases ends the series.

5. Vers. 20–24. *Admonition to chastity*, preparing the way for a subsequent warning against adultery.—**Keep, O my son, thy father's commandment,** *etc.* This general introduction to the new warning against adultery corresponds with the similar preparatory admonitions in chap. v. 1, 2 and vii. 1–5, and serves, like these, to announce the great importance of the succeeding warnings. With respect to ver. 20 in particular comp. i. 8.—Ver. 21. **Bind them to thy heart evermore,** *etc.* So chap. iii. 3 and vii. 3. On account of the plural which occurs in the verse, with which the singular is interchanged in ver. 22, HITZIG conjectures the insertion of this verse by a late interpolator, and that in accordance with the standard furnished by chap. iii. 3, in which place the passage is held to be original. This is arbitrary, for no single ancient manuscript or version confirms the suspicion. Just as well might ver. 22 be declared interpolated, inasmuch as only in this is the singular form found, while immediately after, in ver. 23, the double designation "commandment" and "doctrine" returns.—Ver. 22. **When thou walkest let it guide thee.** The contrast between walking and sleeping or lying is like that in iii. 23, 24.—**When thou wakest let it talk with thee.** The accusative suffix in תְּשִׂיחֶךָ is here employed as in Ps. v. 4; xlii. 4; Zech. vii. 5, *etc.*, for the designation of the person to whom the intercourse indicated in the action of the verb relates. With regard to שִׂיחַ to take, to converse, comp. also Ps. lxix. 18; with reference to the sentence as a whole comp. Ps. cxxxix. 18.—Ver. 23. **For the reproofs of correction are a way of life,** *i. e.*, they lead to life, comp. ii. 19; iii. 2, 16. "Reproofs of discipline" (תּוֹכְחוֹת מוּסָר) corrective reproofs, reproofs whose aim is correction.—Ver. 24. **From the vile woman,** strictly the woman of evil, of vileness. רָע (for which the LXX here read רֵעַ) is therefore a substantive, as in the phrase "the way of evil" in chap. ii. 12.—**From the flattering tongue of the strange woman;** literally, from the smoothness of the tongue of the strange woman. For instead of לָשׁוֹן, from which reading of the Masoretic text the meaning would result "from the smoothness of a strange tongue," we must doubtless point לְשׁוֹן (*construct state*), since the subject of remark here is the strange, wanton woman (just as in ii. 16; v. 20), while the thought of a foreign language (γλῶσση

ἀλλοτρία, LXX) is altogether remote from the context. In opposition to the translation of EWALD, BERTHEAU and ELSTER, "from the smooth-tongued, the strange woman," comp. HITZIG on this passage.

6. Ver. 25-35. Warning against adultery itself. —**With her eyelids**, with which she throws amorous and captivating glances at her lover, comp. Ecclesiast. xxvi. 9. The eyelids (or, more literally, eyelashes) are here compared with the cords of a net, as in Eccles. xii. 3, with the lattice of a window, or as in the erotic songs of the Arabs and Persians, with darts, with lances, daggers or swords.—Ver. 26. **For, for the sake of a harlot one cometh to a loaf of bread**, *i. e.*, to the last bit, the last morsel of bread, as a sign and emblem of utter poverty (thus SCHULTENS, C. B. MICHAELIS, UMBREIT, ELSTER); or again, the meaning may be to the begging a loaf of bread, to beggary (thus ABEN EZRA, VATABLUS, ROSENMUELLER, ELSTER, HITZIG). In opposition to the translation defended by most of the ancient expositors, and recently by ZIEGLER, EWALD, BERTHEAU, *etc.*, "For as the hire of a harlot one gives hardly a bit of bread," or as others prefer "merely a bit of bread," may be adduced 1) the context, see the 2d clause; 2) the lexical fact that עַד can neither mean "hardly" nor "merely;" 3) the fact, historical and archæological, established by Gen. xxxviii. 17. *etc.*, that the harlot's reward in ancient Palestine doubtless amounted to more than a mere loaf of bread, *e. g.* a kid, as in the case cited from Genesis, or a price considerably higher, as seems to follow from Prov. xxix. 3; Ecclesiast. ix. 6; Luke xv. 30.—**Lieth in wait for the precious life**. Very appropriately has נֶפֶשׁ, "life," the predicate יְקָרָה "costly" connected with it; for its value rises above all mere property; comp. Ps. xlix. 8. —Ver. 27-29. The meaning is this: impossible as it is that the clothing on one's breast, or that one's feet should remain unharmed by scorching if fire be brought near them, so inconceivable is it that the adulterer should follow his unlawful intercourse without evil consequences and just retribution. The two questions in vers. 27, 28 imply a strong negation, like the interrogative clauses in Amos iii. 4-6. Ver. 29 is connected with the two negative antecedent clauses as a correlative consequent, and is therefore introduced by כֵּן, so.—Vers. 30, 31. A new figure to illustrate the punishment, surely impending and severe, which threatens the adulterer.—**Men do not overlook the thief**, *etc.;* literally "they do not contemn it in the thief." The imperf. יָבוּזוּ expresses the idea of custom, that which occurs in accordance with experience. [Interpreters are divided between the two ideas of "scorn" and "disregard" as proper renderings of the verb. STUART, MUENSCH., WORDS. adopt the former; men do not despise the thief, though he must be punished; they do despise the adulterer. WORDS. calls attention to a disposition in modern society to reverse this judgment. NOYES, HOLDEN, like DE W., FUERST and our author, adopt the other view.—A.].—**To satisfy his craving when he is hungry**. This circumstance, which exhibits the guilt of the thief in a milder light, serves evidently to display the punishment that befalls the adulterer with whom he is here compared, as one more richly deserved. For the more presumptuous his crime, the less excused, or, as it were, demanded by his necessities, the more just is the punishment that comes upon him! If HITZIG had taken due notice of this meaning of ver. 30, which is transparent enough, he would have seen in advance how unnecessary and excessively artificial is the attempt to explain the verse as interrogative. [KAMPH. adopts his view but does not strengthen it].—**He must restore sevenfold**. According to the prescriptions of the law in Ex. xxi. 37; xxii. 1 sq., it should strictly be only four or fivefold (comp. the publican Zaccheus, Luke xix. 8). But in common life these prescriptions were probably not ordinarily observed: the injured party allowing his silence, his declining a judicial prosecution of the matter, to be purchased at a higher rate than was exactly allowed. Furthermore, that "sevenfold" is here used loosely, only as a round number (comp. Gen. iv. 15), and is not designed, as might be thought, to mark the highest conceivable ransom, appears from the 2d member, which suggests the probability of losing "the whole wealth of his house."—Ver. 32 stands in the same relation to the two preceding as ver. 29 to 27 and 28; it expresses the conclusion that is to be drawn from the meaning, which is clothed in the form of an analogy or parable, with reference to the well-deserved recompense of the adulterer. It is therefore hasty and arbitrary in HITZIG to reject this as a spurious gloss, and to find in ver. 33 the direct continuation of the thief's punishment, which has been depicted in ver. 31.—**He that destroyeth himself doeth such things**. Literally, "whoso will destroy his life, he does it."—Ver. 33. **Stripes and disgrace**. The נֶגַע, *plaga*, may here very well stand in its literal sense, and so designate the blows with which the adulterer detected in the act will be visited by the husband of the unfaithful wife, and will be driven from the house (UMBREIT, HITZIG).—Ver. 34. **For jealousy is man's fierce anger**, *i. e.*, the jealousy (קִנְאָה as in chap. xxvii. 4) of the injured husband is a fire blazing fiercely, burning and raging with all the might of a man; comp. "the hurling of a man" [or as others "a mighty prostration"] Is. xxii. 17. The 2d half of the verse explains this somewhat brief expression, "man's wrath," which, moreover, appears to be chosen not without collateral reference to the more rapidly evaporating wrath of women.—Ver. 35. **He regardeth not any ransom**, literally, "he does not lift up the face of any ransom," *i. e.*, does not receive it as adequate to allay his wrath—as one lifts up the face of a suppliant when his request is granted or favorably received.—**And is not willing**, *i. e.*, to forego his strict right of revenge.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The warning against improvident suretyship in the unqualified form, and the urgent and almost passionate tone in which it is presented

Digitized by Google

in vers. 1-5, rests upon the consideration that "all men are liars" (Ps. cxvi. 11; Rom. iii. 4), that therefore no one can be trusted (comp. Jer. xvii. 5: "Cursed be the man that trusteth in man"), that every neighbor is at the same time in a certain sense a "stranger" to us (see above on ver. 1), in a word, that one must be prepared for manifestations of unfaithfulness, or unreliableness, on the part of any one whatever, though he stood ever so near us. Hence the duty, for the sake of preserving one's own independence and sparing one's own strength for his personal work (bodily as well as mental), of extricating one's self at any cost and as speedily as possible from every relation of suretyship, from the continuance of which injurious consequences might result to our own freedom and welfare. With the admonitions of our Lord in the Sermon on the Mount, to be ready at all times for the lending and giving away of one's property, even in cases where one cannot hope for the recovery of what has been given out (Luke vi. 30, 34, 36; comp. 1 Cor. vi. 7) this demand is not in conflict. For Christ also plainly demands no such readiness to suffer loss on account of our neighbor, as would deprive us of personal liberty, and rob us of all means for further beneficence; and yet this sort of evil result from suretyship is what the author of our passage has in his eye.

2. Also in the subsequent warning against slothfulness (vers. 6-11) the reference to the danger of impoverishment appears to be the main motive, brought forward with especial emphasis. This is above all things else the precise thing to be learned from the example of the ant, that it is important to gather diligently "in summer," that one may not suffer in winter,—that the "harvest time," when all is within reach in abundance, is the time for earnest and unceasing toils, that one may be able calmly to meet the later seasons of want which offer to the most willing and vigorous industry no opportunity for acquiring. Comp. the example of Joseph in Egypt (Gen. xli. sq.), and apply all this to the spiritual department of labors in Christ's service, *e. g.*, those of the pastor, the missionary, *etc.*

3. The six or seven vices, twice enumerated in different order and form of expression, against which the paragraph vers. 12-19 warns (comp. the exegetical notes on ver. 19), are at the same time all of them manifestations of hatred against one's neighbor, or sins against the second table of the Decalogue; yet it is not so much a general unkindness as rather an unkindness consisting and displaying itself in falseness and malice that is emphasized as their common element. And only on account of the peculiarly mischievous and ruinous character of just these sins of hatred to one's neighbor, is he who is subject to them represented as an object of especially intense abhorrence on the part of a holy God, and as threatened with the strongest manifestations of His anger in penalties (vers. 15, 16).

4. As a fundamental proposition for the successful avoidance of all converse with impure wantons, and of the dangers thence resulting, there is introduced in the 1st clause of ver. 25 a warning even against the very first beginnings of all unlawful sexual intercourse, against impure longings, or unchaste desires and thoughts of the heart. Comp. the last commandment of the Decalogue (Ex. xx. 17), as well as Christ's intensifying and spiritualizing of the Mosaic prohibition of adultery; Matth. v. 28.—The admonition also, which is prefixed as introductory, to keep continually before the eyes and in the heart the teachings of Divine wisdom (comp. Tob. iv. 6), serves as an emphatic utterance of this "*Obsta principiis!*" or the exhibition of the necessity that the very first germs and roots of the sin of unchastity must be rooted out.

HOMILETIC AND PRACTICAL.

In the endeavor to comprehend in one homiletic whole the four main divisions of the chapter, one would first of all need to have clearly in view the suggestions given in vers. 2, 11, 15 and 26 sq., with reference to the danger of sinking into poverty and destitution, and to employ these in fixing his central idea. In some such way as this then: Even in the present life want and evil of every sort are wont to be the attendants *a*) of the lighter offences 1) of inconsiderateness (vers. 1-5) and 2) of slothfulness (vers. 6-11); *b*) of the grosser transgressions and vices, such as result 1) from pride and malignity (vers. 12-19), and 2) from lust of the eyes and sensuality (vers. 20-35).—Comp. STÖCKER: Against unfaithfulness in life and conversation, as it displays itself 1) in suretyship; 2) in fulfilling the duties of one's calling: 3) in daily converse with human society; 4) in married life.

Ver. 1-5. STARKE: A teacher of the divine word becomes in a certain sense a surety to God for the souls of his hearers (Ezek. iii. 18); therefore must he watch over them day and night, that none be lost through fault of his (Acts xx. 28).—J. LANGE: In Christ our friend we have a faithful surety who can and will free us from all our debt.—WOHLFARTH: From credulity to put at risk one's property, to which one's children have the first claim, and which one should employ only for the general good, and thereby to give an impulse to the follies and sins of others, is quite as ruinous as it is morally blameworthy.

Ver. 6-11. MELANCHTHON: Diligence is the virtue by which we are disposed steadfastly and firmly for God's sake, and the common welfare, to perform the labors belonging to our calling, with the aid of God, who has promised aid to those that seek it. The extremes of this virtue are indolence and a busy officiousness (πολυπραγμοσύνη). The indolent omits too much; the officious, either from excess of ardor, undertakes many things that are not necessary, or undertakes by-works (πάρεργα) and interferes with others' vocations," *etc.*—EGARD: God will not support thee without work, but by work; that is His holy ordinance (Gen. iii. 19). Do thy part, and God will do His. . . . To know how rightly to employ time and opportunity is great wisdom. Gather in summer that thou mayest have in winter; gather in youth that thou mayest have in old age!—*Berleb. Bible:* Where the ways of Christianity are not directed in accordance with the perfect law of liberty (James i. 25) and according to the impulse of the Spirit of God, but according to any human constitution, there men go more foolishly

Digitized by Google

to work than the ants in their labor.—[TRAPP: They are utterly out that think to have the pleasure of idleness, and the plenty of painfulness].

Vers. 12–19. EGARD: A proud heart has never done anything specially for God's honor and a neighbor's good; through humble hearts God does great things.—STARKE: The evil heart cannot long be hidden; it soon shows itself in evil gestures, words and deeds.—(On ver. 18): The heart underlies the seven vices which are an abomination to God, and in the midst, because it is the fountain from which evil flows in all directions (Matth. xii. 34, 35; xv. 19). The Lord therefore hates not only the actual outbreakings of sins, but also the devices of the ungodly with which they encompass day and night.—(On ver. 16 sq): Eyes, hands, tongue, heart, feet, are in themselves good and well-pleasing to God; but when they turn from the path of virtue and incline to vice, then they are evil and cannot please God.—WOHLFARTH: Before the Lord proud eyes, false tongues, guilty hands, *etc.*, cannot stand. His hand lays hold upon all such transgressors according to the holy law according to which every kind of evil finds its penalty.—[Ver. 16, 17. W. BATES: Pride is in the front of those sins which God hates, and are an abomination to Him. Pride, like an infectious disease, taints the sound parts, corrupts the actions of every virtue, and deprives them of their true grace and glory.—J. EDWARDS: It is vain for any to pretend that they are humble, and as little children before God, when they are haughty, impudent, and assuming in their behavior amongst men.]

Vers. 20–35. STÖCKER (on ver. 25): Solomon here warns chiefly against the things by which one may be enticed into adultery, namely 1) against evil desire and lust in the heart; 2) against wanton, over-curious eyes.—STARKE (on ver. 25): Since evil lusts spring up in the heart, Solomon would have us at the very beginning stop up the fountains, *i. e.*, suppress the very first instigations of corrupt flesh and blood (James i. 14, 15). For it is always more difficult to extinguish sparks already existing than to guard against the heart's receiving any.—VON GERLACH (on vers. 34, 35): The fearful rage of the jealous husband grows out of the deep feeling that the wife is one with her husband, a part of him, whose worth cannot be counterbalanced by any possession however great, outside of him.—Comp. J. LANGE: Just as little as the adulterer taken in his adultery is left unpunished by the injured husband, so little, yea even less will the spiritual adulterer remain unpunished of the Lord (1 Cor. iii. 17).

---

18. New admonition to chastity, with a reference to the warning example of a youth led astray by a harlot.

CHAP. VII. 1–27.

1 My son, keep my words,
and treasure up my commandments with thee.
2 Keep my commandments and thou shalt live—
and my instruction as the apple of thine eye.
3 Bind them to thy fingers,
write them on the tablet of thine heart.
4 Say to wisdom "Thou art my sister!"
and call understanding "acquaintance,"
5 that they may keep thee from the strange woman,
from the stranger that flattereth with her words.—
6 For through the window of my house,
through my lattice I looked out,
7 and I saw among the inexperienced ones,
discerned among the youths, a young man void of understanding.
8 He passed along the street near her corner,
and sauntered along the way to her house,
9 in the twilight, in the evening of the day,
in the midst of the night and darkness.
10 And lo, a woman cometh to meet him,
in the attire of a harlot, and subtle in heart.
11 Boisterous was she, and ungovernable;
her feet would not tarry in her house;
12 now in the street, now in the market places,
and at every corner did she watch.

Digitized by Google

13 And she laid hold upon him, and kissed him,
put on a bold face and said to him,
14 "Thankofferings were (binding) upon me,
to-day have I redeemed my vows;
15 therefore came I out to meet thee,
to seek thy face, and I have found thee.
16 Tapestries have I spread upon my couch,
variegated coverlets of Egyptian linen;
17 I have sprinkled my couch
with myrrh, aloes and cinnamon.
18 Come, let us sate ourselves with love till morning,
and enjoy ourselves in love!
19 For the man is not at home,
he has gone a long journey;
20 the purse he has taken with him;
not till the day of the full moon will he return."
21 She beguiled him with the multitude of her enticements,
by the allurements of her lips she led him astray.
22 He followed her at once,
as an ox goeth to the slaughter,
and as fetters (serve) for the correction of fools—
23 till an arrow pierceth his liver:—
as a bird hasteneth to the snare,
and knoweth not that his life is at stake.—
24 And now, ye children, hearken to me,
and observe the words of my mouth!
25 Let not thine heart incline to her ways,
and stray not into her paths.
26 For many slain hath she caused to fall
and all her slain are many.
27 Ways of hell (is) her house
going down to the chambers of death.

GRAMMATICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 7. [אָבִינָה, the ו consec. omitted, as is sometimes the case, the form resembling a simple Intentional. GESEN. *Lehrgeb.* p. 874., BÖTT. §§ 969, 6; 973, 5. STUART (comm. in loc.) seems to be in error in regarding this a real voluntative, and rendering "that I might see among the simple, and observe, *etc.*"—A.].

Vers. 8. [For the form פִּנָּהּ instead of the full form פִּנָּתָהּ (with the ordinary form of fem. nouns with suff.), see BÖTT. § 724, *b*. Comp. however Exegetical notes in regard to the proper reading.—A.].

Ver. 11. [יִשְׁכֹּנוּ, used of repeated recurrence in the past—*Fiens multiplex præteriti* according to the terminology of BÖTT. § 949, *f*.—A.]

Ver. 13. In the verb הֵעֵזָה (lit., she made hard, *corroboravit*) the doubling of the 2d radical is omitted, as in הֵחֵלָּה, Jud. xx. 40. [Given by BÖTT. § 500, 5, as an example of the simplifying of that which is usually doubled, to express the idea of the permanent, gradual or gentle. See also § 1123, 3. Comp. GREEN, § 141. 1; STUART, § 66, 11.—A.].

Ver. 15. [STUART's rendering of the last clause as final, "that I might find, *etc.*," is unnecessary; it is rather a simple consecutive.—A.].

Ver. 18. [נִתְעַלְּסָה, the *cohortative* use of the Intentional. BÖTT., § 965, 2.—A.].

EXEGETICAL.

1. From the preceding warnings against unchastity and adultery (chap. ii. 16-19; chap. v.; chap. vi. 20-35) the one now before us is distinguished by the fact, that the poet, after a preliminary general introduction (vers. 1-5; comp. chap. vi. 20-24), for the sake of delineating more clearly the repulsiveness and various consequences of intercourse with wanton women, depicts in narrative form the example of a single adulterous woman, who by her lascivious arts betrays a foolish youth into adultery. This is therefore a didactic narrative, with a purpose of earnest warning, here presented as a conclusion to the second larger group of admonitory discourses. It is not possibly an allegory, for nothing whatsoever in the text points to such a conception of the adulteress, by virtue of which she might be regarded as introduced as a personification of the abstract idea of folly (in contrast with that of wisdom personified). Not till we come to chap. ix. 13 sq. do we find such a presentation of folly under the image of a wanton, adulterous woman.—In contrast with the expositors of the ancient church, most of whom gave allegorical interpretations, the correct view is

Digitized by Google

found as early as M. Geier, Vatablus, Mercerus, Egard, Hansen, Michaelis, Starke, and also in nearly all the moderns except Von Gerlach. The view of several of those named, especially that of Starke, that the whole narration is to be regarded a true history, an actual experience of the poet, lacks sufficient support in the style and form of the delineation. The history may just as well be imaginary as the contents of many narrations of Christ,—*e. g.*, that of the good Samaritàn, of the prodigal son, *etc.*

2. Vers. 1–5: Introduction in a general form, in which ver. 1 reminds us of chap. i. 8; ii. 1; vi. 20; so ver. 2 of iv. 4; ver. 8 of iii. 8; vi. 21; ver. 5 of ii. 16; vi. 24.—Ver. 2. **And my teaching as the apple of thine eye**, lit. "as the little man in thine eye." The same figurative description is found in Arabic and Persian (see Umbreit on this passage). Comp. also the Greek κόρη, κοράσιον (=בַּת־עַיִן [the daughter of the eye] Lam. ii. 18) and the Latin *pupa, pupilla*. The apple of the eye is also in Deut. xxxii. 10; Ps. xvii. 8: Zech. ii. 12, the emblem of a precious possession guarded with peculiarly watchful care.—Ver. 3. **Bind them to thy fingers**, not precisely as an amulet, as Umbreit thinks, but as an ornament, a costly decoration, like a ring; comp. Song Sol. viii. 6, and the observations on iii. 8.—Without adequate reason Hitzig regards the verse as spurious, on account of its partial correspondence with Deut. vi. 8; xi. 18. As though the figures here employed, especially that in the first clause, did not occur very frequently within the sphere of the Old Testament, and that in every instance with a form somehow slightly modified! Comp. *e. g.*, Ex. xiii. 9, 16; Jer. xxii. 24; Hag. ii. 23.—Ver. 4. "**Thou art my sister!**" Comp. Job xvii. 14; xxx. 29; Wisd. viii. 2. The parallel "acquaintance" in the 2d clause corresponds with the Hebrew expression מוֹדָע, which denotes knowledge, acquaintance, and then (abstract for the concrete, as occurs, *e. g.*, also in the use of the French *connaisance* [and the English "acquaintance"]) one well known, a friend, *familiaris*. The same expression is found also in Ruth ii. 1 as the K'ri. Comp. P. Cassel on this passage, who however both for that passage and the one before us gives the preference to the K'thibh מְיֻדָּע (comp. Ps. lv. 14; lxxxviii. 9) as the more primitive reading.

8. Vers. 6–9. *The foolish young man.*—**Through my lattice I looked out.** Comp. the quite similar representation in the song of Deborah, Judges v. 28. אֶשְׁנָב denotes as it does there a latticed aperture, an arrangement for the circulation of fresh air (Hitzig).—Ver. 7. **And I saw among the inexperienced**; literally, among the νηπίοις, the simple; comp. remarks on i. 4, where the same expression פְּתָאִים is used, synonymous with נַעַר, boy, as here with בָּנִים. It is not necessary, with Arnoldi, Bertheau and Hitzig, to explain the expression in exact accordance with the Arabic by *juvenes* [young men].—Ver. 8. **Near a corner.**—The Masoretic punctuation פִּנָּהּ with mappik in the ה (comp. מִדָּהּ, Job xi. 9) represents the corner as hers, *i. e.*, the corner of the adulteress, the corner of her house,—and many recent expositors, *e. g.*, Umbreit and Hitzig, translate and explain accordingly. But inasmuch as according to ver. 12 (which Hitzig, without any reason, pronounces spurious), the adulteress is accustomed to watch "at every corner," therefore at street corners in general, it is not quite needful to refer the corner here mentioned to her dwelling. All the ancient versions moreover have read only the simple פִּנָּה (LXX: παρὰ γωνίαν; Vulg.: *juxta angulum, etc.*).—**And sauntered along the way to her house.**—Psychologically it is pertinent to depict the young man predisposed to sin as strolling before the house of the adulteress, and this as the beginning of his imprudence, so far forth as he thus plunges himself into temptation. The verb צָעַד is fairly chosen, as it always expresses a certain care and intention in his going. We say substantially "he measures his steps, he paces before her door" (Umbreit).—Ver. 9. **In the twilight, in the evening of the day.**—The accumulation of the expressions is explained by the fact that it was fitting to characterize the action and conduct of the young man as belonging to the works of darkness, the deeds of night. Comp Luke xxii. 53; Rom. xiii. 12; 1 Thess. v. 4-7, *etc.* There is furthermore no contradiction between the notation of time in the first clause and that in the second; for נֶשֶׁף strictly signifies not the first evening twilight, but the later period of evening darkness, from 9 o'clock to 12 (see Job vii. 4; xxiv. 15), and so the time immediately bordering upon the true black night or midnight.—**In the blackness of night**—literally, "in the pupil of the night," comp. xx. 20, K'ri. The *tertium comparationis* is to be found, doubtless in both, the blackness and the middle, and not in the first alone, as Umbreit holds. Comp. besides the phrase "heart of the night" in the poetic language of the Persians (see Umbreit on this passage).

4. Vers. 10-20. *The adulteress.*—**In the attire of a harlot.**—שִׁית זוֹנָה, dress of a harlot (comp. with respect to שִׁית, dress, apparel, Ps. lxxiii. 16), stands here with no connecting word in apposition to "woman;" a woman a harlot's dress, as though the woman herself were nothing more than such a dress. Thus, and with good reason, Bertheau explains [and Words.], while Hitzig altogether artificially explains שִׁית by שְׁוִית (from שָׁוָה) as equivalent to דְּמוּת, likeness, and accordingly translates "with the outward appearance of a harlot;" in the same way also the LXX: εἶδος ἔχουσα πορνικόν.—**Subtle in heart.**—נְצֻרַת לֵב is strictly "one who is guarded in heart," *i. e.*, one whose heart is guarded and inaccessible, who locks up her plans and counsels deep in her breast, comp. Is. lxv. 4. Thus Chr. B. Michaelis (citing the French *retenu*), Umbreit, Bertheau, Elster, *etc.*, and from earlier times at least the *Vers. Veneta*: πεφυλαγμένη τὴν καρδίαν. [With these Wordsw. is in substantial agreement; "her heart is like a walled fortress," *etc.*]. The other ancient versions expressed the idea "one carrying away the heart of the young man," as though they had read נֹצֶרֶת (so also recently

Digitized by Google

ARNOLDI). EWALD explains "of hardened heart, bold and confident;" HITZIG, in accordance with the Arabic and comparing the *saucia* in VIRGIL'S *Æneid*, IV. 1: "an arrow in her heart, wounded by love's dart," and therefore ardent and wanton—both of these being plainly altogether artificial and adventurous. [FUERST, treating the adjective as fem. constr. from נָצוּר, renders "watching (for hearts of young men").—**Boisterous was she and ungovernable.**—With the first epithet (literally, shouting) comp. chap. ix. 13: with the second, Hos. iv. 16, where the same word is used of a wild heifer that will not submit its neck to the yoke.—Ver. 12. **Now in the street,** *etc.*—That we have only here a custom, a habit of the wanton woman described, while in the preceding verse we have delineated her condition in a single instance, is an entirely arbitrary assumption of HITZIG'S, which is altogether opposed by the use of the Imperfect in both cases (יִשְׁכְּנוּ, ver. 11, and תֶּאֱרֹב, ver. 12). Therefore the argument that the verse is spurious, resting as it does mainly on this alleged difference in the substance and scope of the verse, is to be rejected (comp. above, remarks on ver. 8).—Ver. 13. **Put on a bold face.**—Comp. chap. xxi. 29; Eccles. viii. 1.—Ver. 11. **Thank-offerings were binding upon me**—that is, in consequence of a vow, as the second clause shows. She has therefore on the day that is hardly gone ("to-day"—the day is here represented as continuing into the night) slain a victim in sacrifice that had been vowed to the Lord for some reason or other, and has prepared for a meal the flesh of this animal, which in accordance with the law, Lev. vii. 16, must be eaten on the second day, at the latest. To this meal, which, to judge from the description of the luxurious furnishing of the chamber, in vers. 16 sq., is no simple affair, she now invites the young man.—Ver. 16. **Variegated coverlets of Egyptian linen.**—חֲטֻבוֹת which the older translators nearly all interpret as "variegated coverlets," the larger number derive from the Arabic خَطَبَ, to be many colored (therefore *tapetes versicolores s. picti*, as it is found as early as the Vulgate); BERTHEAU, on the contrary, derives from חטב=חצב to cut, to make stripes or strips (therefore *striped* material); HITZIG finally derives from the Arab. عُطْب cotton, appealing to PLINY, *H. N.*, XIX., 1, 2, according to whom cotton fabrics in great quantity were manufactured from native material. The first of these explanations, as the simplest and best attested, deserves the preference.—אֵטוּן is equivalent to the Ægypt. *Athiouniau*, linen, and is found in Greek also in the form ὀθόνη or ὀθόνιον. [The rendering of the E. V. "with carved works, with fine linen of Egypt" conforms too closely to the primary meaning of the verb חָטַב "to carve." It cannot refer to any carved frame work of the bed, but rather to the embroidered figures which resemble carving—A.].—Ver. 17. **I have sprinkled my couch,** *etc.*—HITZIG, who translates the verb by "I have perfumed," has in mind a mere perfuming of the bed or of its apparel by means of the swinging of a censer filled with myrrh, aloes and cinnamon. But while נוּף does properly signify to raise, to swing, yet the signification "sprinkle" is easily enough derived from this; and although the spices in question were not sprinkled precisely in the form of water holding them in solution, they still produced a satisfactory result if strewed upon the coverlets of the couch in little bits, fragments of the bark, fibres or scales. In no other way than this is it to be supposed that the same fragrant materials (with *cassia*) were employed, according to Ps. xlv. 8, in perfuming the king's robes of state; comp. also Song Sol. iii. 6; iv. 14.—Ver. 18. **Let us sate ourselves with love,** *etc.*—Comp. v. 19, and also the phrase שִׁכְרוּ דוֹדִים, Song Sol. v. 1.—**Enjoy ourselves in love.**—Instead of the meaning "enjoy" or "delight one's self," well attested by Job xx. 18; xxxix. 13, the old interpreters give to the verb in this instance the stronger meaning "to embrace passionately, to cohabit" (LXX: ἐγκυλισθῶμεν ἔρωτι; AQUILA and THEODOTION: συμπεριπλέκωμεν; so also HITZIG: "let us join in love's indulgence!"). But it is plainly unnecessary to substitute an obscene import, artificially and with a possible appeal to the Arabic, for the simpler meaning, which is abundantly attested by the *usus loquendi* of the Old Testament.—Ver. 19. **The man is not at home.**—Let it be observed with how cold and strange a tone the faithless wife speaks of her husband.—**He has gone a long journey.**—Lit., "upon a journey from afar;" the idea "from afar" is loosely appended to that of "journey" in order to represent not so much the way itself as rather the person traversing it as far removed.—Ver. 20. **The purse he hath taken with him**—and therefore proposes extensive transactions at a distance from home, and will continue journeying a considerable time.—**On the day of the full moon he will return.**—In the Hebrew the כֶּסֶא (for which in Ps. lxxxi. 4 we have the form כֶּסֶה) forms an alliteration with the כֶּסֶף in the first member, which is probably not undesigned; "the verse flows so smoothly along (comp. ii. 13) and one imagines that he hears the sweetly musical voice of the betrayer" (HITZIG). Furthermore the "day of the full moon" is not a designation of the full moon of the feast of tabernacles which was celebrated with peculiar festivities (UMBREIT, ELSTER), but the expression plainly relates to the next succeeding full moon. Since now, according to ver. 9, the time to which the narrative relates must be about new moon, the cunning woman means to hint that her husband will not return for about a fortnight. See HITZIG on this passage.

5. Vers. 21-23. *The result of her enticing arts.* Ver. 21. **With the multitude of her enticements.**—לֶקַח, learning (i. 5; ix. 9) is here ironically employed of the skilful and bewildering rhetoric which the adulteress has known how to employ.—With the expression "smoothness of lips" comp. "smoothness of tongue," chap. vi.

Digitized by Google

24.—Ver. 22. **At once**, Hebrew פִּתְאֹם, implies that he had at first hesitated, until this fear of his to take the decisive step was overcome by evil appetite, and he now with passionate promptness formed the vile purpose and executed it at once, to cut off all further reflection. Here is evidently a stroke in the picture of the profoundest psychological truth.—**As an ox goeth to the slaughter.**—Therefore following another, and with a brutish unconsciousness. Comp. the corresponding figure, which, however, is used with a purpose of commendation, in Is. liii. 7. **And as fetters** (serve) **for the correction of the fool.**—With the fetters (עֶכֶס comp. Is. iii. 18) we have here compared, of course, the adulteress who suddenly and by a single effort prevails upon the thoughtless youth,—and not, possibly, the young man himself (as UMBREIT supposes, who finds the significance of the comparison in this, that the foolish and ensnared youth is represented first as a dumb beast, and then as a simply material physical thing, as a mere dead instrument. As the obstinate fool (אֱוִיל) who treads a forbidden path, is suddenly caught and held fast by the trap lying in it, so has the deceitful power of the adulteress caught the foolish young man. Thus, and with probable correctness, ELSTER, and long ago many of the older expositors, like SOL. GLASS, *Philol. Sacra*, p. 738, and M. GEIER on this passage (only that they unnecessarily explain by an *hypallage:* "as fetters for the correction of a fool," in other words, "as the fool (comes) to the correction of fetters"). Somewhat differently BERTHEAU, and before him LUTHER, STARKE, *etc.* [and recently STUART]; "He comes as if to fetters, which are decreed for the correction of the fool;" but to supply before אֶל עֶכֶס from the preceding has the order and parallelism against it. [FUERST regards the noun as an instrumental accus., and translates "and as in fetters, *i. e.*, slowly, the fool is led to correction,"—but regards the evidence as all indicating a defective text. NOYES and MUENSCHER treat the noun as instrumental, but vary the construction of the other words: "as one in fetters to the chastisement of the fool." WORDSW. suggests two or three renderings, of which that of NOYES is one, but indicates no preference. ZÖCKLER's rendering is brought, we think, with the least violence, into correspondence with the other two comparisons, where the idea is plainly that of a certain fate, notwithstanding unconsciousness of it. So fetters await the fool, though he may not be aware of it—A.] Many older interpreters, either failing to understand the figure, or judging it inconsistent with the context, have sought relief in more violent ways. The LXX, *Peschito* and Targums explain the עֶכֶס or some word substituted for this, as referring to a dog (LXX: *ὥσπερ κύων ἐπὶ δεσμούς*), which is here made a parallel to the ox and then the bird in the following verse; so also more recent commentators, like MICHAELIS, KÖHLER, *etc.* The Vulgate probably read כֶּבֶשׂ instead of עֶכֶס, since it translates "as a wanton and stupid lamb." Others, as of the older class the LXX, *Peschito*, Targums, Arabic vers., *etc.* altered the אֱוִיל to אַיָּל stag, and connected it with ver. 23; so also more recently SCHELLING and ROSENMUELLER, *e. g.*; "and like a deer rushing into fetters." HITZIG finally treats the passage with the greatest violence, since he transfers ver. 23, third clause, to the place of the 2d clause in ver. 22; in this line, by altering עכס to כעס he changes the meaning to "for the fool is angry at correction;" he finally transposes the first and third clauses of ver. 23, so that the two verses have this general import:

Ver. 22. "He followeth her at once,
as an ox that goeth to the slaughter,
and as a bird hasteneth to the snare.

Ver. 23. For the fool is angry at correction,
and seeth not that it is for his life,
until an arrow pierceth his liver."

This might indeed have been originally the meaning of the passage; but inasmuch as neither manuscripts nor old versions give any evidence of any other arrangement as having ever existed, the whole emendation retains only the value of a bold hypothesis.—Ver. 23. **Till an arrow pierceth his liver.**—Since this clause plainly refers to the young man, and neither exclusively to the ox nor the fool, the two examples of a self-destroying folly which in the second and third clauses of ver. 23 are compared with him, its position is parenthetical (UMBREIT, ELSTER, BERTHEAU, *etc.*); for in the following clause still another example is added to the two mentioned before,—that of the bird hastening to the snare. The "liver" stands here as the representative of the vitals in general (comp. Lam. ii. 11) as in some instances the heart or again the reins (Ps. xvi. 27; lxxiii. 21; Prov. xxiii. 16, *etc.*). According to DELITZSCH, *Bibl Psychol.*, pp. 275 sq., the liver is here made prominent as the seat of sensual desire. Since the ancient Greeks, Arabians and Persians in fact connected this idea with the organ under consideration, and since modern Oriental nations also predicate of the liver what we say of the heart as the seat of the feelings and sensibilities (*e. g.*, the Malays in Java, see *Ausland*, 1868, p. 278), this view may be received as probably correct. By no means is the designation of the liver in the passage before us to be regarded as a purely arbitrary poetical license or as a mere accident.—**And knoweth not that his life is at stake**, literally, "that it is for his soul;" the expression בְּנַפְשׁוֹ signifies "at the price of his life," comp. Numb. xvii. 3.

6. Vers. 24–27. *Concluding exhortation* introduced by "and now," like the corresponding final epilogue, chap. viii. 32; comp. also v. 7.—Ver. 25. **And stray not**, אַל תֵּתְעְ, [a dehortative] from תָּעָה, to go roaming about, comp. שָׂטָה chap. v. 20.

Ver. 26. **And all her slain are many.** עֲצֻמִים, meaning "strong" (BERTHEAU), is nevertheless on account of the parallelism with רַבִּים in the first member to be taken in the sense of "numerous, many," comp. Ps. xxxv. 18; Joel i. 5. [HOLD., NOYES, MUENSCH., DE W., K., agree with our author; STUART and WORDS., like the E. V., keep closer to the original idea of strength,

Digitized by Google

"many strong men" have been her victims.—A.] With the expression in the first member comp. Judges ix. 40.

Ver. 27. **Ways of hell—her house.** "Her house" is the subject, having here a plural predicate connected with it, as chap. xvi. 25; Jer. xxiv. 2.—**Chambers of death.** Comp. "depths of death" or "of hell," chap. ix. 18: and with reference to the general sentiment of the verse, chap. ii. 18; v. 5.

DOCTRINAL, ETHICAL, HOMILETIC AND PRACTICAL.

From the earlier and copious warnings against adultery the one now before us is distinguished by the fact, that while chap. v. contrasted the blessing of conjugal fidelity and chaste marital love with unregulated sexual indulgence, and chap. vi. 20-35 particularly urged a contending against the inner roots and germs of the sin of unchastity,—our passage dwells with special fullness upon the temptations from without to the transgression of the sixth commandment. It also sets forth the folly and the ruinous consequences of yielding to such temptations, by presenting an instructive living example. What elements in this vivid moral picture stand forth as ethical and psychological truths to be taken especially to heart, has been already indicated by us in the detailed interpretation. Aside from the fact that it is nocturnal rambling that delivers the thoughtless, heedless and idling youth into the hands of temptation (ver. 9), and aside from the other significant feature, that after a first brief and feeble opposition he throws himself suddenly and with the full energy of passion into his self-sought ruin (ver. 22; comp. James i. 15), we have to notice here chiefly the important part played by the luxurious and savory feast of the adulteress as a coöperating factor in the allurement of the self-indulgent youth (see ver. 14 sq.). It is surely not a feature purely incidental, without deeper significance or design, that this meal is referred to as preceding the central and chief sin; for, that the tickling of the palate with stimulating meats and drinks prepares the way for lust and serves powerfully to excite sexual desire, is an old and universal observation, comp. Ex. xxxii. 6 (1 Cor. x. 17). "The people sat down to eat and to drink, and rose up to play:" as also similar passages from classical authors, *e. g.* EURIPIDES, *Alcestis*, 788; PLAUTUS, *Miles gloriosus*, III., 1, 83; ARRIAN, *Anab. Alex.*, II., 5, 4; and the well-known Roman proverb from TERENCE (*Eunuch.*, IV., 5, 6; comp. APPUL., *Metam.*, II., 11), "*Sine Cerere et Libero friget Venus*" [without Ceres (food) and Bacchus (wine) Venus (love) is cold]: and finally TERTULLIAN, *de jejun. adv. Psychicos, c.* 1: "Lust without gluttony would indeed be deemed a monstrosity, the two being so united and conjoined that, if they could by any means be parted, the sexual parts would first refuse to be attached to the belly. Consider the body; the region is one, and the order of the vices conforms to the arrangement of the members; first the belly, and all other sensuality is built immediately upon gluttony; through indulgence in eating sensual desire ensues," *etc.*

In the homiletic treatment we are naturally not to dwell too long upon these details, lest the entire impression produced by the picture of the young man ensnared by the adulteress be unduly weakened. An analysis of the chapter into several texts for sermons is inadmissible on account of the closely compacted unity of the action. At the most, the five introductory verses may be separated as a special text (comp. STARKE); yet even these would better be connected closely with the whole, and all the more since they conform very nearly in expression and contents to similar introductory paragraphs of a somewhat general nature, of which there have already been several (see exeget. notes, No. 2).

The homily that should comprehend the entire chapter might therefore present some such theme as this: *How the dangers from temptation to unchastity are to be escaped.* Answer: 1) By avoiding idleness as the beginning of all vice (ver. 6, sq.); 2) By shunning all works of darkness (ver. 9); 3) By subduing the sensual nature, and eradicating even the minor degrees of evil appetite (ver. 14 sq.); 4) By the serious reflection, that yielding to the voice of temptation is the certain beginning of an utter fall from the grace of God, and of eternal ruin (vers. 21, 27).—Comp. STARKE: Sin is like a highway robber, that at first joins our company in an altogether friendly way, and seeks to mislead us from the right path, that it may afterwards slay us (Rom. vii. 11).—Imaginary pleasure and freedom in the service of sin are like gilded chains with which Satan binds men. Though the tempter is deeply guilty, he who suffers himself to be tempted is not for that reason excused. Let every one therefore flee from sin as from a serpent (Ecclesiast. xxi. 2).—Comp. M. GEIER: Be not moved by the flattering enticements of the harlot, the world, false teachers (that betray into spiritual adultery and abandonment of God), or of Satan himself. Close thine ears against all this, *i. e.* refuse in genuine Christian simplicity and faithful love to the Lord to hearken to any solicitation to disobedience. Follow not Eve's example, but Joseph's, Gen. xxxix. 8, *etc.*—[TRAPP: (ver. 9) Foolish men think to hide themselves from God by hiding God from themselves.—(Ver. 22). Fair words make fools fain].

Digitized by Google

Third Group of Admonitory or Proverbial Discourses.

CHAP. VIII. 1—IX. 18.

14. A second public discourse of wisdom personified.

CHAP. VIII. 1-36.

a) The richness of her gifts.

(VERS. 1-21.)

1 Doth not wisdom cry aloud,
and understanding lift up her voice?
2 Upon the top of the high places, by the way,
in the midst of the way she placeth herself.
3 By the side of the gates, at the exit from the city,
at the entrance to its doors she calleth aloud:
4 "To you, ye men, I call,
and my voice is to the sons of men!
5 Learn wisdom, O ye simple ones,
and ye fools, be of an understanding heart!
6 Hear, for I speak plain things,
and the utterances of my lips are right things;
7 for my mouth meditateth truth,
and wickedness is an abomination to my lips.
8 All the words of my mouth are right,
there is nothing crooked or false in them;
9 they are all right to the man of understanding,
and plain to them that have attained knowledge.
10 Receive my instruction and not silver,
and knowledge rather than choice gold!
11 For wisdom is better than pearls,
and no precious things equal her.
12 I, wisdom, dwell with prudence,
and find out knowledge of sagacious counsels.
13 The fear of Jehovah is to hate evil,
pride, arrogance and an evil way,
and a deceitful mouth do I hate.
14 Counsel is mine, and reflection;
I am understanding; I have strength.
15 By me kings reign
and rulers govern justly.
16 By me princes rule
and nobles, all the judges of the earth.
17 I love them that love me,
and they that seek me find me.
18 Riches and honour are with me,
increasing riches and righteousness.
19 Better is my fruit than the purest, finest gold,
and my revenue than choice silver.
20 In the way of righteousness do I walk,
in the midst of the paths of justice,
21 to ensure abundance to those that love me,
and to fill their treasuries.

Digitized by Google

b) The origin of her nature in God.

(VERS. 22–31.)

22 Jehovah created me as beginning of his way,
before his works of old.
23 From everlasting was I set up,
from the beginning, before the foundation of the earth.
24 When there were as yet no floods was I brought forth,
when there were no fountains abounding with water.
25 Before the mountains were settled,
before the hills was I brought forth;
26 while as yet he had not made land and plains
and the first clods of the earth.
27 When he prepared the heavens I was there,
when he stretched out the firmament over the deep;
28 when he established the clouds above,
when the fountains of the deep raged loudly;
29 when he set to the sea its bounds,
that the waters should not pass its border;
when he settled the foundation pillars of the earth;
30 then was I at his side as director of the work,
and was delighted day by day,
rejoicing before him continually,
31 rejoicing in his earth,
and my delight did I find in the sons of men.

c) The blessing that flows from the possession of her.

(VERS. 32–36.)

32 And now, ye children, hearken unto me:
Blessed are they that keep my ways!
33 Hear instruction, and be wise,
and be not rebellious.
34 Blessed is the man that heareth me,
watching daily at my gates,
waiting at the posts of my doors!
35 For whosoever findeth me findeth life
and obtaineth favor from Jehovah;
36 and whosoever sinneth against me wrongeth his own soul:
all they that hate me love death."

GRAMMATICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 2. בֵּין—בֵּית, *in the midst*, is an Aramaic idiom, occurring also in Ezekiel xli. 9.—A.

Ver. 3. As to the form תָּרֹנָּה comp. i. 20. [Bött. 929, δ.—A.]

Ver. 5. Instead of הָבִינוּ לֵב [understand ye in heart, "be ye of an understanding heart," E. V.], we should probably read with the LXX [*ἐνθέσθε καρδίαν*], Vulg., Arnoldi and Hitzig הָכִינוּ לֵב, direct your heart, *i. e.*, exert your understanding, *applicate animum*. Comp. לֵב נָכוֹן, Ps. lvii. 8; and also 1 Sam. vii. 3; Job xi. 13; and to illustrate the use of לֵב in the sense of the understanding, the reason, comp. several other passages in the Proverbs, especially xv. 32; xvii. 16; xix. 8.

Ver. 6. נְגִידִים. [An illustration of the principle that "single adjectives describing what is pre-eminent or striking appear in the more elevated style, raised as it were to personality, and are therefore put in the masc. plural;" see Böttcher, § 707, 2.—A.]

Ver. 13. שְׂנֹאת, [an infinitive of a verb לא having the feminine termination of the verbs לה; see Bött., § 1068, 13.—A.].

אֹהֵב [regularly אֹאֲהֵב,—after the rejection of one of the weak consonants, the vowel is "assimilated" from the initial vowel of the neighboring form אֹהֲבַי; for examples of the normal modification, אֹהֵב, with and without suffixes, see Mal. i. 2; Hos. xi. 1; xiv. 5; Ps. cxix. 167.—Bött., § 425, *h*.—A.]

יְמַצְאֻנְנִי, [an example of the retention of the fuller form of the plural ending with weakened vowel and toneless suffix; see Bött., § 1047, *f*.—A.]

Digitized by Google

Ver. 24. מַעְיָנוֹת. With this fem. plural form there occurs in an isolated instance, Ps. civ. 10 [together with four others of construct and suffix forms], the masculine מַעְיָנִים; for which reason the masc. of the adjective נִכְבַּדֵּי is the less striking (BERTHEAU).

Ver. 25. [Perfect tense with טֶרֶם in the sense of a Pluperfect. BÖTT., § 947, c.—A.]

Ver. 29. [וְלֹא יַעַבְרוּ. Imperfect with וְלֹא in sense of an Imperf. Subj., "so that," *etc.* BÖTT., § 949, 8, 2.—A.]

Ver. 29. בְּחוּקוֹ stands either for בְּחֻקּוֹ, or as HITZIG perhaps more correctly assumes for the Poal form בְּחוּקְקוֹ. [BÖTTCHER prefers the first of these explanations, citing this as an example of usage varying in certain words, and suggesting as a reason for the adoption of the fuller form in this case, correspondence with בְּשׂוּמוֹ in the first clause. See §§ 766, η, and 1147.—A.]

EXEGETICAL.

1. Preliminary Remark. From the preceding larger group of admonitory discourses (chap. iv.–vii.), that now before us, comprising only chap. viii. and ix., is distinguished chiefly by the fact that it returns to the representation, which has already been made in chapters i.–iii. of Wisdom as a person. And this is so done that the two features of the representation which there appeared separately; the exhibition of Wisdom as a public preacher (i. 20-33), and as a divine agent in the creation of the world (iii. 19–26), are now combined in one whole. Here Wisdom appearing as a preacher herself testifies to the aid which she rendered God at the creation (viii. 22 sq.). Besides this point of contact with the first main group, we may also direct attention to the mention of the fear of God as a disposition in the most intimate alliance, and even identical with wisdom (viii. 13); this also is common to the division before us and the first; for only in chapters i.–iii. (see i. 7; i. 29; ii. 5; iii. 7) was any express utterance given to this form of the Hhokmah doctrine. The middle group (chap. iv.–vii.) nowhere contains the expression "the fear of Jehovah." There are however continually coming to view many connections between the second and third groups; especially the plural address "ye children," repeated in the discourse of the personal Wisdom (viii. 32) from chap. iv. 1; v. 7; vii. 24 (see above, p. 95). Observe also the representation of Folly personified, as a counterpart to Wisdom (chap. ix. 13–18), appearing as an adulteress of mien and bearing quite like the adulterous woman of chap. vii. who is as it were exhibited here, "developed into a more comprehensive character" (comp. HITZIG, p. 69).—Furthermore this last section of the first main division of the Book of Proverbs consists of only two discourses of unequal length, chapters viii. and ix. each of which, however, in turn includes several subdivisions clearly distinguishable,—chap. viii., comprising the three that have been given above, and chap. ix. the two parallel delineations of the personal Wisdom (vers. 1–12) and Folly personified (vers. 13–18).—The unequal length of the two discourses HITZIG seeks to a certain extent to remove by striking out from chap. viii. a large number of verses, sixteen, and from chap. ix. a smaller number, six, as spurious additions by a later hand. His grounds of distrust are, however, here again of a purely subjective kind, and do not present for a single one of the passages in question any reliable evidence of their spurious character, as we shall hereafter have occasion to show in detail.

2. Vers. 1–3. **Doth not wisdom cry aloud?** This form of interrogation (with הֲלֹא) which expects as its answer an assenting and emphatic "Yes, truly!" points to the fact clearly brought to view in all that has preceded, that wisdom bears an unceasing witness in her own behalf in the life of men.

Ver. 2. **Upon the top of the high places by the way**, in order that those who pass along by the way may observe her. **In the midst of the way.** This Aramaic idiom gives no occasion for pronouncing the passage spurious (contrary to the view of HITZIG, who furthermore takes exception to the allusion to "high places" in the 1st clause, and therefore summarily pronounces the entire 2d verse interpolated). UMBREIT translates "at the house where roads cross," and interprets, not indeed of an inn located at cross-roads (as DÖDERLEIN does), but still of a house situated at the junction of several streets. But these "ways" are roads, solitary paths, not streets in the city, and the delineation proceeds in such an order as to exhibit Wisdom first, in ver. 2, as a preacher in the open country, in grove and field, on mountains and plains, and then in ver. 3 to describe her public harangues in the cities, and in the tumult of the multitudes. The condition therefore is unlike both to that presented in i. 20, 21, and to that in ix. 13, where in both cases the interior of a city alone furnishes the scene for Wisdom's activity as a preacher.

Ver. 3. **At the exit from the city**, literally "towards the mouth of the city," *i. e.*, standing at the gate and facing the streets which centre there.—**At the entrance to its doors**, (comp. i. 21), *i. e.*, standing on the farther (outer) side of the gateway.

3. Vers. 4–11. This more general introduction to Wisdom's discourse, with the addition of ver. 12, HITZIG declares spurious, partly on account of the alleged tautological nature of vers. 6–9, giving no genuine progress to the thought,—partly because ver. 10 is almost identical with viii. 19, and ver. 11 with iii. 15,—and lastly, partly because of the peculiar form אִישִׁים in ver. 4, which is said to betray a later date. Yet this very form is found also in Isa. liii. 3, and Ps. cxli. 4, for both of which passages the later origin (in the exile, or even after the exile) is in like manner yet to be established. And as respects the alleged tautologies and repetitions, similar ones occur throughout the entire Book of Proverbs (comp. Introd. § 12). The codices and old versions, however, know nothing whatever of the absence from the text of even a single one of these verses.

Ver. 5. **Learn wisdom, O ye simple ones.** Comp. i. 4.—**Ye fools, show understanding**, see critical note, above.

Digitized by Google

Ver. 6. **I speak plain things.** The word here translated "plain" might, it is true, designate "noble, princely things," (comp. the *σεμνά* of the LXX, the "*res magnæ*" of the Vulg., *etc.*); [So Wordsw., Holden, N. and M.], the parallelism however renders more natural the signification "plain, evident" (*clara, manifesta*); [So Stuart]; comp. a similar term in ver. 9. This only appropriate sense we find already given in the Chaldee and Syriac versions.

Ver. 7. **For my mouth meditateth truth,** literally, "my palate," comp. Song Sol. v. 16; Job xxxi. 30. The function of speech does not appear to be here immediately associated with the palate, but, as the antithesis in the 2d clause shows, rather the inward moulding of the word as yet unspoken, by the silent working of the spirit,—the reflective consideration which precedes speech.

Ver. 8. **Right,** literally, "in righteousness." For this use of the preposition employed to introduce the predicate, and forming as it were the transition to the בְּ *essentiæ*, compare passages like Prov. xxiv. 5; Ps. xxix. 4, and Ewald, § 217 f.

Ver. 9. **Right to the man of understanding . . . plain to them that have attained knowledge.** *Straight* and *plain* stand contrasted with the *crooked* and *false* of the preceding verse. [Trapp: "Plain in things necessary to salvation; for as all duties so all truths do not concern all men. God doth not expect or require that every man should be a doctor in the chair; but those points that direct to duty here and salvation hereafter, are clear, express and obvious to them that desire to understand them."]

The "man of understanding" is he who is so wise as not to despise the words of wisdom, who rather duly takes them to heart. "They that have attained knowledge," literally "the finders of knowledge," are those who have made progress in the sphere of ethical knowledge, the "knowing," the mature and experienced. Umbreit incorrectly interprets "to them that wish to find knowledge;" the participle is here to be taken in a preteritive sense; comp. Gen. xix. 14; Neh. x. 29. [Other examples may be found cited by B ttcher, § 997, 2, II.]

Ver. 10. **Receive my instruction and not silver,** *i. e.*, when you have the choice prefer my instruction to silver. There is therefore here a comparison like that in the 2d clause, only somewhat otherwise expressed.—**Rather than choice gold.** Hitzig, following the LXX and Chald., "than tried gold." But נִבְחָר means "selected, chosen," and we have no trace elsewhere of the use of the partic. נִבְחָן, which is indeed similar in form and easily substituted, for the designation of *tried* gold (*χρυσίον δεδοκιμασμένον*). Comp. besides ver. 19, and in the foregoing, iii. 14; with ver. 11 comp. iii. 15.

4. Vers. 12-21. **I, Wisdom, dwell with prudence.** That Wisdom who is speaking here emphatically calls herself by name is doubtless to be explained by the fact that only just before, in ver. 11, she had spoken of herself in the 3d person. Very unwarrantably Hitzig infers from this circumstance the spuriousness of this verse also.—The "dwelling" of wisdom "with prudence" expresses a confidential or friendly relation,—the same idea which is elsewhere indicated by the Hiphil of the closely related verb סָכַן; comp. Ps. cxxxix. 3; Job xxii. 21. Inasmuch as the verb stands here with the simple accusative of the noun, without the prepositions ordinarily signifying "with" (for this construction comp. *e. g.*, Ps. v. 5) many translated "I inhabit prudence" and so conceive of prudence either as the sheltering roof (as *e. g.*, Umbreit explains), or as a property subject to the disposal of prudence (thus Bertheau); but both are alike harsh and inapposite. The correct view is found in Ewald, Hitzig, Elster, the last of whom illustrates the relation of wisdom to prudence by the remark, "prudence (עָרְמָה) denotes here right knowledge in special cases, in contrast with the more comprehensive idea of intelligence in general; the practical realization of the higher principle of knowledge found in wisdom (חָכְמָה)."—**And find out knowledge of sagacious counsels.** "To find out knowledge" here stands for "to know" (comp. Job xxxii. 13); the expression as a whole would therefore find its equivalent in the simpler "and know sagacious counsels" (וְאֵדַע מְזִמּוֹת). Comp. furthermore the notes on i. 14.

Ver. 13. **The fear of Jehovah is to hate evil.** Only thus far is the 1st member of this ver. to be carried; the following expressions, "pride," "arrogance," and "an evil way" (literally, "way of evil") are, in spite of the present accentuation, to be regarded as prefixed objects to the verb "I hate," so that the meaning of the entire verse is substantially this; "Inasmuch as the fear of God, this beginning of all wisdom (see i. 7; ix. 10) comprises within itself as a distinguishing characteristic the hatred of evil, I, wisdom, accordingly hate everything proud, wicked and crafty." (Comp. Hitzig on this passage). The general proposition forming the first member of the ver., which naturally gives us no exhaustive definition of the fear of God, but only a description of it by one of its chief characteristics (comp. Heb. xi. 1), is therefore, as it were, the major premise, from which the conclusion is drawn that forms the 2d and 3d members. The minor premise, however, which might have had some such form as the first clause of chap. ix. 10, is omitted; the reasoning, as it here stands, taking the form of a *lemma.* In opposition to the diverse methods of punctuating and interpreting, such as are found in Umbreit, Bertheau, and most of the earlier commentators, comp. Hitzig and Elster on this passage.—For the expression "mouth of deceit" or "crafty mouth" comp. ii. 12; x. 31.

Ver. 14 Hitzig pronounces an addition growing out of the similar passage Job xii. 13, as he also explains the two following verses as "founded upon the reading of Isa. xxxii. 1," and condemns them. But the accordance with these other passages is far too remote and partial to permit us to think of a derivation from them. In the case of ver. 14 and Job xii. 13 we might more readily think of the converse relation of dependence, in case one must at all maintain any such relation as existing, which seems hardly necessary. For as respects the expressions "wisdom," "coun-

Digitized by Google

sel," "understanding," and "strength," which are brought into combination in these verses, they are found, with the exception of the second, combined elsewhere, especially in Isa. xi. 2, where they are adduced quite as they are here, as attributes of the true ruler. The instances of *paronomasia*, however, in vers. 15 and 16, ("kings are kings," and "rulers rulers"), were of themselves so natural, and suggested themselves so obviously, that neither for the author of our verses was there need of any reading of Isa. xxxii. 1, nor for Isaiah of any recollection of Prov. viii. 15, 16, to give occasion for the employment of this trope.—[Wordsw.: Sound wisdom, the very essence of things, whence they derive their soundness and strength].—**I am understanding, I have** (lit. "mine is") **strength.** This change in the pronouns is certainly not undesigned: "understanding" is to be exhibited as one with wisdom, "strength" however (*i. e.*, true efficiency or energy), as a possession, or more precisely a result of wisdom, just as previously in the first clause "counsel" and "reflection" (comp. with respect to them ii. 17) are named as constant products, possessions, or attributes of wisdom.

Ver. 16. **And nobles, all Judges upon earth.** These two subjects, attached without any copula to the "princes" of the 1st clause, are plainly intended to signify that all possible diverse classes of princes or rulers derive their power from the celestial wisdom of God (comp. the similar enumerations in Eph. i. 21; Col. i. 16, *etc.*). The idea that this proposition can hold only of *just* rulers, owes its origin doubtless to the old reading "judges of righteousness" (צֶדֶק) instead of "judges of the earth" (אֶרֶץ), (found in Syr., Chald., Vulg, R. Norzi, and still preferred by Bertheau). See objections to this and arguments in support of the Masoretic text in Hitzig.

Ver. 17. **I love them that love me.** This conforms to the pointed text (אֹהֲבַי). The written text (אֹהֲבֶיהָ), "them that love her (Wisdom)" is not in keeping with the context, seems to have been occasioned by a wandering of the transcriber's eye to the form of the verb following [which although a peculiar form of the 1st person—see critical note above—might, unpointed, be mistaken for a form of the 3d person], and has therefore with abundant reason been rejected by all the old versions, several MSS., and by most of the recent interpreters (Umbreit, Ewald, Elster, and Hitzig).—With the 2d clause of ver. 17, comp. i. 28.

Ver. 18. Comp. iii. 16.—**Increasing riches.** This is probably the meaning which, with Hitzig, we should adopt (growing means, "*wachsend Vermögen*"); for the common rendering, "old" or "durable" riches, seems less appropriate, since the old is by no means necessarily the sound and permanent. Comp. rather, with reference to the idea of a steadily growing or accumulating wealth, Ps. lxii. 10.—**And righteousness.** What this here signifies is more fully explained in the first clause of ver. 20.

Ver. 19. **Better is my fruit,** comp. the representation of wisdom as the tree of life in chap. iii. 18, and to illustrate the "purest, finest gold" (in Hebrew properly two synonymous expressions for the idea of "fine gold," comp. Ps. xix. 11; xxi. 4; Song Sol. v. 11) compare iii. 14.

Ver. 21. **To ensure abundance to those that love me.** The word here translated "abundance" (יֵשׁ) must here necessarily be a substantive, of similar import with a derived form (תּוּשִׁיָּה) occurring in ii. 7, and substantially equivalent to the ὕπαρξις of the LXX and the οὐσία of the Venetian version. For the verb "to ensure" plainly requires an object, and the position of this noun at the end of the clause shows that this is precisely the object governed by the verb. Moreover, if Hitzig's conception of the expression as an impersonal verb in the sense of *præsto est*, it is at my command, ("I have it") were correct, we ought rather to have a pronominal object (יֵשׁ לִי, "there is to me"). The verse as a whole, therefore, forms a conclusion to the preceding, setting forth the object of Wisdom's walking in paths of righteousness as described in ver. 20; in other words, what result follows from such a course to her friends and attendants. Comp. Bertheau on this passage. After ver. 21 the LXX has the words, "If I declare to you the things that occur day by day, I will remember to enumerate the things that are from eternity" [ἐὰν ἀναγγείλω ὑμῖν τὰ καθ' ἡμέραν γινόμενα, μνημονεύσω τὰ ἐξ αἰῶνος ἀριθμῆσαι]. This addition is evidently designed to prepare the way for the subsequent description of the antemundane origin and working of Wisdom; it appears, however, as ill adapted to this as to any possible place either at the beginning of the chapter, such as Jaeger proposes to assign it (*Observatt.*, p. 68), or again before ver. 10, where Hitzig would be disposed to transfer it.

5. Vers. 22-26. In this delineation of the divine origin of the personal Wisdom, the first half directs attention first to her existence before time, or her creation as the first of all created things.—**Jehovah created me as the beginning of his course.** Thus versions as old as the LXX (ἔκτισε), Chald., Syriac, with most of the modern commentators;—while the exegesis of the ancient church from the time of the Arian controversy judged itself compelled to render the verb in the sense of *possedit me* (Vulg.), or ἐκτήσατο (thus the Vers. Venet. and even Aquila); and this turn of expression was given, that the idea of a creation of eternal Wisdom, or what was equivalent, of the personal Word of God, might be excluded. But against the rendering, "Jehovah possessed me," may be adduced, 1) the fact that the verb (קָנָה) does not signify simply "to possess," but "to attain to the possession," "to acquire," which latter signification would find here a poor application; 2) the fact that the adjunct of the verb (רֵאשִׁית דַּרְכּוֹ) agrees better with the idea of creating than that of possessing; 3) that the double mention of Wisdom's "being born," in vers. 24, 25, and not less the expression in ver. 23, "I was set up" ("or wrought out"), corresponds better with the idea of a creation than with that of possessing or having; and 4) that the parallel passages, Ecclesiast. i. 4, 9; xxiv. 8, which are evidently

Digitized by Google

formed on the model of that before us, also employ the verb *κτίζειν* (create), and not some such as *ἔχειν* or *κέκτησθαι* (have or possess). Even though accordingly the personal Wisdom is represented as one *created* at the beginning of the divine activity, not *begotten*, as a *κτίσμα, οὐ γέννημα*, still we may by no means draw from this the conclusion of the correctness of the well-known Arian dogma that the Son of God is the first creation of God. For the delineations of the whole passage before us are of a poetical nature, and are not adapted to a direct application in forming dogmatic conceptions; and the personal Wisdom of our didactic poem is by no means simply identical with the Logos, or the Son of God. Comp. the Doctrinal notes.—"The beginning of His way" is a second accusative depending on the verb; "as beginning or first fruit of His way," *i. e.* His activity, His creative efficiency, His self-revelation. Instead of the singular, "His way," we ought perhaps, with the LXX, the Vulgate, and many recent expositors, especially HITZIG, to read in the plural "His ways" (דְּרָכָיו); the parallel expression "before His works" seems to speak decidedly for this reading.—**Before his works.** The word here translated "works" (מִפְעָלִים) occurs only here; yet comp. the corresponding feminine form in Ps. xlvi. 9 (מִפְעָלוֹת). The word translated "before" (קֶדֶם) HITZIG regards as also a substantive, synonymous with "beginning" (רֵאשִׁית), and therefore translates "as foremost of His works." Yet the conception of it as a preposition is favored by the usage of the O. T. elsewhere.—**Of old** (מֵאָז), long ago, literally, "from long ago," comp. Ps. xciii. 2.

Ver. 23. **From eternity.** It seems necessary, with the expositors of the early church and many of recent times, such as UMBREIT, BERTHEAU, ELSTER, *etc.*, to regard this difficult verb which follows as a Niphal from נָסַךְ, and therefore to translate it "I was anointed," *i. e.* consecrated to a priestly royalty; comp. the *ordinata sum* of the Vulgate. But the verb is not elsewhere used in this conjugation; and the parallelism with ver. 22, as well as with those following, calls for a verb having some such meaning as "establish, create, call into being." It seems therefore needful to read with the LXX, "I was established" (נוֹסַדְתִּי="ἐθεμελίωσέν με"), or, which would be better advised, so to interpret the form in the text as to give the idea of a being created, or something equivalent. To this end we may either translate, with the *Versio Veneta*, comparing Ecclesiastic. i. 9 (*ἐξέχεεν αὐτὴν*), *κέχυμαι*, "I was poured forth," or which is on the whole to be preferred, with HITZIG we may vary the punctuation (נְסַכֹּתִי), so that the expression shall stand as Perfect Niphal, of the verb סָכַךְ, and have the signification "I was woven or wrought;" with this may be compared Ps. cxxxix. 15; Isa. xxxviii. 12.—**From the beginning, from the foundation of the earth.** "From the beginning," as in Isa. xlviii. 16. "The foundation of the earth," an expression like that occurring in Isa. xxiii. 7 (קַדְמַת אֶרֶץ), denoting the earliest primæval period, the time of the beginning, the origin of the earth. How this establishment or production of Wisdom "from the foundation of the earth" is to be understood, namely, in the sense of an existence of Wisdom even prior to the earth (comp. Ps. xc. 2), appears from the three following verses.

Ver. 24. **When there were as yet no floods.** HITZIG regards the mention of the waters before the mountains as inappropriate, and therefore conjectures that the verse is spurious. As though in Ps. civ. 6 and Job xxxviii. 8 the seas were not mentioned immediately before the earth as a whole, and also before the mountains!—**Fountains abounding with water.** The meaning is, doubtless, the springs from which the floods or the deep broke forth; comp. Gen. vii. 11, and below, ver. 28.

Ver. 25. **Before the mountains were as yet settled**, with their "roots" (Job xxviii. 9) in the pliant earth; comp. Job xxxviii. 6, where mention is made of the settling even of the pillars of the earth (in the infinite space of the heavens). With the second clause comp. Ps. xc. 2.—**Land and plains.** The LXX had in their day correctly rendered חוּצוֹת by *ἀοικήτους* [uninhabitable places]; these are "unoccupied commons or plains," regions lying outside the occasionally occupied land (comp. Job v. 10).—**The first clods of the earth.** Thus, with HITZIG, are we to understand this expression, and not "the sum or mass of the clods of the earth" (COCCEIUS, SCHULTENS, BERTHEAU, ELSTER, *etc.*); and still less "the first men" (JARCHI), or even "man as born of the earth" (UMBREIT); these last interpretations are plainly too far-fetched.

6. Vers. 27-31. From the antemundane existence of Wisdom the poet now passes over to the description of her active coöperation in the creation of the world. The same progress from the pre-existence to the world-creating activity of the divine Logos is found in several passages of the N. T., especially in John i. 1-3, Col. i. 15-16.—**When he stretched out the firmament over the deep**, *i. e.* when He fixed the vault of heaven, the arch of heaven (comp. Gen. i. 8; Job xxii. 14), over the waters of the earth, as a barrier between the upper and lower waters (Gen. i. 6; Job xxvi. 10). Over the deep, in the Hebrew literally "upon the surface of the deep," comp. Gen. i. 2.

Ver. 28. **When he fixed the clouds above.** Literally, "when He made firm, made strong" (בְּאַמְּצוֹ); *i. e.* the clouds are, as in Job xxvi. 8; xxxviii. 37, conceived of as bags, which only in case they are suitably secured and do not burst, prevent the mighty outpouring of the upper waters upon the earth.—**When the fountains of the deep** (see ver. 24 above) **raged violently.** This is the interpretation to be given, with UMBREIT, WINER, HITZIG, *etc.*; for the verb here unquestionably has the intransitive meaning, *invalescere, vehementer agitari* (comp. in Isa. xliii. 16 the "mighty waters"). The transitive signification, "when He made firm, *i. e.* restrained, bound up" (LXX; most of the other versions, and recent interpreters

Digitized by Google

like ELSTER) is inadmissible from the absence of the suffix with the infinitive.

Ver. 29. **When he set to the sea its bounds.** "Bound" here in its local sense, limit, barrier, as in Jer. v. 22; substantially the same as "its border" (פִּיו) in the 2d member. For this expression (פִּי הַיָּם) mouth or shore of the sea, instead of the phrase, elsewhere usual, "lip of the sea" (שְׂפַת הַיָּם), as in Gen. xli. 8; comp. Isa. xix. 7; and for the description of the separation between the sea and the land in general, see Gen. i. 9, 10; Ps. xciv. 9.—**When he settled the foundation pillars of the earth**; end of the description of the earth's creation, comp. Job xxxviii. 6.

Ver. 30. **Then was I at his side as directress of the work.** This noun, derived from a verb (אָמַן) signifying to be firm, true, reliable (and also kindred to יָמִין, *dexter*, "the right hand," yet not to be regarded as HOFFMANN takes it, *Schriftbew.*, I. 95, as an infinitive absolute used adverbially, but necessarily as a substantive), denotes like the parallel form found in Song Sol. vii. 2, "*artifex*, artist, master of the work." [So WORDSW., HOLD., MUENSCH., NOYES: STUART translates "confidant."—A.] Comp. the description, undoubtedly based on the passage before us, found in Wisdom vii. 21: ἡ τῶν πάντων τεχνῖτις σοφία ("wisdom which is the worker of all things"); comp. the epithet ἁρμόζουσα (adapting) in the LXX, and the *cuncta componens* of the Vulgate, in our passage. In opposition to the rendering of אָמוֹן by "foster-child, *alumnus, nutricius*" (AQUILA, SCHULTENS, ROSENMUELLER, ELSTER) may be urged first, that then in accordance with Lam. iv. 5 we ought to point אָמוּן, [which pointing BÖTTCHER favors, see § 660, 6 and *n.* 1], and then, that this form could hardly have stood in the text as a substantive without some adjunct defining it more closely. The verb should be rendered, not "then became I" (BERTHEAU), but "then was I." For the existence of wisdom before the world's creation and at the time of the world's creation formed the principal subject of the preceding description, and not, *e. g.*, her passing from previous rest to more active relations.—**And was delighted day by day.** Literally, "I was delight day by day." This abstract noun plainly stands in the predicate quite as appropriately as the parallel term in the 3d clause (the participle מְשַׂחֶקֶת) and aims like this expression to indicate that wisdom enjoyed and delighted in her creative activity. For the idiomatic use of this abstract noun comp. *e. g.*, Ps. cix. 4 ("but I am prayer"); also notes on vii. 10 above.—The verse following then declares that this her delight and exultation relates particularly to the manifold creatures of the earth, chiefly to man. The creative agency and control of the wisdom of God in the origin of the earth and its inhabitants, is therefore here represented as attended and sustained by the heartiest satisfaction in the natures that are created, especially in man, the personal image of God; and this is quite in harmony with the "God saw that it was good" of the six days of creation (Gen. i. 10, 12, 18, 31); comp. also Wisdom vii. 22, 27, 29 sq. A reference of these expressions in ver. 31 to any period subsequent to the creation (UMBREIT: "In his earth do I now delight and am the joy of the children of men," comp. MERCERUS and many of the elder interpreters, and also LUTHER), is suggested by nothing in the context, and is rather decidedly at variance with the connection. Not before ver. 32 does the author with "and now" return from the past to the present. When HITZIG feels constrained to strike out as spurious the second clause of ver. 30 ("and I was in joy of heart day by day"), and also the 1st clause of ver. 31 ("sporting in His earth"), this results from the fact that he has wholly missed the progressive character of the description, which gradually descends from God and His seat in the heavens to earth, and more specifically to the human race: just as, in his representation which shows throughout a peculiarly external and mechanical conception of the nature of wisdom, he maintains, "The 1st clause of ver. 31 comes into contradiction with the first of ver. 30; for if wisdom is near Jehovah she cannot appropriately be at the same time disporting herself on the earth!" A mere hasty glance at the later representations of the nature and activity of the hypostatic Wisdom, like Wisd. vii. 8; Ecclesiast. xxiv., *etc.*, might have convinced HITZIG of the superficial and untenable nature of such a view. Yet this is in truth nothing more than the necessary fruit of his entire rationalistic view of God and the world.

7. Vers. 32-36. *Concluding admonition and promise*, based on ver. 22-31 as well as ver. 1-21. —Ver. 33. **Hear instruction,** *etc.* HITZIG would have this whole verse stricken out "because it has no rhythm," and because it comes in only as a disturbing element between the benedictions in ver. 32, 2d clause, and ver. 34. But the lack of rhythm that is asserted rests on the conception of the subjective taste: and the position between two benedictions produces no distraction whatever; all the more since to the first and shorter of these two sentences beginning with "Blessed," a corresponding admonition had been prefixed, ver. 32, 1st clause.—**And be not rebellious.** Thus with UMBREIT, ELSTER, *etc.*, must we understand the prohibition without a grammatical object (וְאַל תִּפְרָעוּ). To supply from the 1st clause the idea "instruction" is unnecessary, especially since the intransitive "and be wise" had been interposed as the immediate antithesis to the verb "refuse, or rebel." For the etymology and signification of this verb (פָּרַע) see, furthermore, notes on i. 25.

Ver. 34. **That hearkeneth to me, watching,** *etc.* The expression, "so that he watch" (לִשְׁקֹד) like the following phrase "so that he keep," expresses not so much the design as the result of hearkening to wisdom; these expressions give, as it were, the manner of this hearkening, and thus correspond with the ablative of the gerund in Latin, or with the pres. participle (LXX: ἀγρυπνῶν—τηρῶν).—**For whosoever findeth me, findeth life.** This is in accordance with the K'ri. The K'thibh is somewhat

Digitized by Google

more artificial, "for the finders of me are finders of life," *i. e.*, those who find me, they find life. One may choose between the two readings which in import do not differ. [RUETSCHI proposes (*Stud. u. Krit.*, Jan. 1868, p. 134) to solve the difficulty in another way, retaining the consonants of the K'thibh, but modifying the punctuation, so that the two forms will be singular and apparently identical (מֹצְאִי), the second being a form artificially constructed with ִי as a "union vowel," (EWALD, § 211, *b*, 1), so as to secure the juxtaposition of two forms apparently the same.—A.].—**And obtain favor from Jehovah.** Literally "and draws forth," *i. e.*, gains for himself, harvests, bears away.

Ver. 36. **And whosoever sinneth against me.** Literally "who misseth me" in contrast with "who findeth me" in ver. 35. Comp. Job v. 24; Judges xx. 16.—**All they that hate me love death.** Comp. iv. 13, 22; vii. 27, and also Ezek. xviii. 31.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. For a correct understanding of the section before us two things in general are to be observed: 1) that the entire discourse is poetical, and that therefore the personification of Wisdom which forms its chief subject is also to be regarded as essentially, and in the first instance, the product of a bold poetical sweep of thought, and of a vivid oriental imagery; 2) that, however, because of the solemn earnestness and profoundly religious character of the discourse, its figurative element cannot possibly be viewed as the mere play of fancy; or an empty ringing of phrases, but must rather every where stand in more or less exact harmony with the supersensuous truth that is to be set forth. Wisdom, which here appears personified, as the principle of the world's creation, as well as of its preservation and government, having sprung from God himself, and being absolutely supernatural, is no unsubstantial phantom, no unreal fiction of the fancy, no poetic creation without an underlying higher reality. It is rather a result of the profoundest religious and ethical inquiry, an object of the purest and most genuine knowledge of divine things, nay a product of divine revelation—only that this revelation has here passed through the medium of a poetic conception and representation, and for that very reason appears in its formal relations partially reflected, broken, or inaccurately exhibited. It is really the free poetic form, ideal in its portraiture, to which must be charged whatever in the statements before us is partially inadequate, inconsistent, and not directly applicable in the formation of dogmatic ideas. The substance, which is easily separable from this form, bears the impress of the most genuine divinely revealed truth, and forms one of the most important and strongest of the foundation pillars of Old Testament theology, on which the theology and Christology of the New Testament is reared, the doctrine of the Trinity in the ancient church, and indeed the whole glorious structure of Christian dogmatics.—Comp. STAUDENMAIER, *Die Lehre von der Idee*, pp. 81 sq., and particularly NITZSCH, *Ueber die wesentl. Dreieinigkeit Gottes* (Letter to Lucke, in the *Stud. und Krit.*, 1841, ii.; especially pp. 310 sq.).

2. In the picture of wisdom drawn in our chapter the two conceptions of the divine wisdom, and the wisdom of the creature, or of the celestial type of the Hhokmah and its earthly and human counterpart, are plainly so combined that they more or less flow into each other, and without a clear discrimination of their difference interchange, (as in the shorter description of the protection and blessing going forth from God's creative wisdom for those who honor it,—chap. iii. 19-26). That wisdom is at the outset introduced as teaching and preaching (vers. 1 sq.), shows at once that she is regarded essentially as a self-conscious personal being, as a reflection therefore of the absolute personality, or the Godhead. And even within the first section (vers. 4–21), which refers in the first instance only to her manifestations in the moral and religious life of man, several features suggest the supernatural in her nature and relations. Thus especially the predicates "counsel, understanding, strength," (in ver. 14) with which she is endowed as the Messiah is in Isa. xi. 2. So also the allusion to the fact that she imparts to and preserves for the kings, rulers, princes, and judges of the earth, all their power (vers. 15, 16); and finally, with no less plainness, the declaration that she "loves them that love her," and accordingly shows herself to be the dispenser of all benefits and blessings to her faithful ones (ver. 16-21). Of a purely earthly and creature principle all this could not be asserted. It is plainly not an abstract conception of moral philosophy, or any definition pertaining to the moral and intellectual conduct of men, that is thus described, but something higher, a nature fundamentally identical with the divine providence, the activity of God in preserving and ruling the world,—a personal principle belonging to God's revelation of Himself, which is not essentially different from the Logos of the New Testament or the Son of God.

This conception of the idea of a superhuman wisdom, which determines and controls with absolute power and knowledge the destinies of our race, conducts, however, immediately to the proper and hypostatic representation of Wisdom as an emanation from God's eternal nature, as the partaker and mediator in His absolutely creative activity. From the description of Wisdom as the mediating principle in divine Providence (vers. 14-21), the poet passes to the exhibition of her mediating participation in the creation of the world, and in this connection he reveals in the same act the deepest sources and beginnings of her nature (vers. 22-31). Wisdom is, it is true, also a creation of God, but one coming into being before all other creatures, a "first born" (*πρωτόκτιστον*) a "beginning of the creation of God" (*ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ*), comp. Rev. iii. 14. And for that very reason she took part in His work of creation; she was not merely witness, but helper in the revelation of His power in the primitive creation that called His heavens and earth into being. She manifested herself as the regulative and formative principle, who in those mighty acts of creation "rejoiced before Him," *i. e.*, developed before Him in free, happy action, as it were in joyous sport and play, her infinitely

Digitized by Google

rich life, and thus produced an infinite number and variety of creature forms. This creative activity of wisdom found however its end and its completion in the creation of men in whom she has her delight in an altogether pre-eminent degree (ver. 31) for they are called to be her conscious recipients, and under her enlightening influence to grow up into a walk in holy fellowship with God. Precisely for this reason the possession of wisdom, *i. e.*, in the first instance that comparative, creative wisdom which is identical with the fear of God and righteousness, is the sum of all that can be recommended to man as the means to the attainment of the highest temporal and eternal welfare. For this relative wisdom is in fact nothing but the reflection and emanation of that which is absolute. It is the absolute divine wisdom as this has found its individual reflection in the life of individual man, —the eternal wisdom of God entering into the subjective conditions of man, and so becoming creatural. When the concluding verses of the chapter (vers. 32–36) emphatically advise the obtaining of this wisdom which has thus become mundane and human, and point to the blessed consequences of its possession, they seize again upon that which was the starting-point in the whole admonition, and show how the secondary wisdom is derived from the primitive and conducts again to it, how the same holy life-power infinite in its perfection, which was active in the first creation of the world and of man, must also be efficient in their moral recreation and their perfecting after God's likeness. Comp. STAUDENMAIER, as cited above, p. 38: "The eminence of man consists not merely in the fact that wisdom comes in him to self-consciousness, but also in the fact that by the Creator there has been conferred upon him in the gift of freedom the power to become as it were the second creator of his own life according to the innate divine idea. This idea appears therefore now a practical one: the impulse to become practical existed already in its living energy, or was this very energy; and with this it is at the same time clear that man with his freedom has pre-eminently a practical religious and moral problem set before him. Since however by this very freedom he also has it in his power not to follow his destination, and even to resist it, Wisdom appeals to him to hear her voice, and does this as she speaks to him both from within and from without,—from within by ideas (through the voice of reason and conscience), from without, through divine revelation in which absolute wisdom dwells."

3. This representation of wisdom as a personal principle mediating between God and man, existing in God as the prototype, in man in the antitype, plainly stands in the closest relationship to the doctrine of the Logos in the New Testament.*

The connection, it is true, with a right exegesis of the main points involved (see notes on vers. 22, 23, and 30, above), does not reach so far that wisdom is described outright as a child of God, begotten in eternity and "anointed," *i. e.*, solemnly consecrated and sealed,—and so is attended by those characteristic predicates with which Christ describes His absolutely unique metaphysical relation as Son to God (John x. 36; v. 26; xvii. 5; comp. i. 1, 18). And yet when she also is declared to have been created as beginning of the ways of God, there are surely not wanting emphatic intimations that her character is absolutely above that of creatures in both respects, that which concerns her coming into being before all creatures, and also her intimate fellowship of essence and of life with God. While furthermore the primæval consecration to be a ruler over all things, to the ranks of a priestly regal mediatorship between God and His creation is not to be found among the points expressly emphasized in the description of Wisdom, yet the way in which she is described in vers. 14–16, as possessor and dispenser of all sovereign power and wisdom, reminds us distinctly enough of the omnipotence in heaven and earth that is given to the Son, and of His being endowed with the undivided fulness of the Divine Messiah-Spirit,—which Isaiah in his day pronounces a spirit of all wisdom and understanding, all counsel, all strength, knowledge, and holy fear (Isa. xi. 2; comp. John iii 34; Matth. xxviii. 18). And although, finally, the name "son" or "child" is not given to her, and the "exultation" in the presence of God at the time of His creative activity, cannot fitly be conceived of as the intimation of a relation in any way like that existing between a sportive favorite child and his father, still the appellation "directress of the work" characterizes this being distinctly enough as a personal emanation from the very nature of God. And a mediatorial participation not only in the creative, but also in the redemptive and sanctifying activity of God is suggested, if only in gentle intimation, by what is said of her "delight in the sons of men." To these points of correspondence which are presented in the chief individual features of the picture in Prov. viii. 22 sq., there may be added several unmistakable allusions to our chapter found in the New Testament. Among these the essential identity of the creative wisdom of God that is here described, with the Logos or the pre-existent Christ stands out most distinctly. When our Lord in Matth. xi. 19 (Luke vii. 35) and probably also in Luke xi. 49 (comp. VAN OOSTERZEE on this passage) designates himself as the "Wisdom of God," and at the same time speaks of "children of this wisdom," meaning by this the men who are subject to her revealing and enlightening influence, especially the Jews, as having been Divinely influenced by law and prophecy, He can have chosen this mode of designating Himself only with His eye upon the Biblical delineations that were familiar to His hearers; and to these, beside Ecclesiasticus xxiv. and Wisdom vii.–ix., *etc.*, the passage be-

* Comp. NITZSCH as cited above: "Do you see here no trace of a divine process, a germ of an ontological self-distinction in God? For this Wisdom is indeed a first God's communication localized in the world, particularly in man, and still more especially in Israel. Yet it will be understood as no mere creature like others, no angel, no dependent power or effect: it claims to be known and honored in its divinity. Without exhausting the idea of divinity it claims to be God of God—"Jehovah created me"—a creation which according to the connection gives no natural, creaturely being, but has a significance plainly transcending these bounds, *etc.*"—The truth of this representation holds also as against that which VON HOFMANN (*Schriftbew.*, I. pp. 95 sq.) has brought forward in support of the opposite view, *i. e.*, that which denies the hypostatic nature of wisdom in our passage.

Digitized by Google

fore us would pre-eminently belong. When John ascribes to the Divine Logos both alike, the acting as medium of the activity of God in the creation of the world, and the accomplishment of His enlightening and saving efficiency on the world,—when he in doing this distinctly characterizes the Logos not as a mere attribute or impersonal reason of God, but as a hypostasis self-conscious and freely coming forth from the absolute ground of the Divine essence, as a Divine personality seeking incarnation (John i. 1-18), the harmony of this description of his with Solomon's praise of the Divine Wisdom cannot have continued to be merely unconscious. And this is all the less possible, from the consideration that this wisdom had already before his time and in manifold instances been designated by the name Λόγος, *e. g.*, Ecclesiast. i. 4 (comp. xxiv. 8), Wisdom, ix. 1. When Paul in numerous passages asserts the same of his pre-existent Christ (especially 1 Cor. viii. 6; Col. i. 15 sq.; Phil. ii. 5 sq.), among the passages from the Old Testament lying at the foundation of his views in this matter, Prov. viii. 22 sq., cannot have been wanting. And furthermore his designation of the Son as the "Wisdom of God" (1 Cor. i. 24, 30; comp. Rom. xiii. 27; Col. ii. 3) cannot have developed itself on any other basis. The same holds finally also of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (see Heb. i. 2 sq.), as well as of the writer of the Apocalypse, who, by his emphatic use of the name of the Logos (Rev. xix. 13), shows himself plainly enough to be no other than the Evangelist John. His peculiar designation of Christ, already adduced above, as "the beginning of the creation of God" (chap. iii. 14) may perhaps be viewed outright as a literal allusion to verse 22 of our chapter.*

If this were the case, the idea of a "beginning of the creation of God" would by no means for that reason require to be interpreted in the Arian sense. For in an author who elsewhere adopts the doctrine of the Logos the representation of Christ as the first creature of God would palpably be a monstrosity. John can in this expression intend to designate the Lord only as the active principle in the creation (comp. DUESTERDIECK on this passage). In just this active sense shall we be obliged to interpret the expression which possibly suggested John's language,—the "beginning of the ways of Jehovah" in our chapter, *i. e.*, as relating to that activity of the eternal Wisdom of God which commenced His manifestation of Himself in creation, its mediating coöperation in God's world-creating act (see remarks on this passage above).

4. The only noteworthy difference between the idea of the Logos in the New Testament, and the hypostatic Wisdom of our passage consists, therefore, in the decidedly *created* character ascribed to the latter by the expression "Jehovah created me" in ver. 22, and the parallel expression in ver. 23. Our teacher of wisdom in the Old Testament, near as he may have come to the idea, was therefore unable to rise to an altogether clear discernment of the relation existing between God and His eternal Word, who in all His likeness of nature is yet personally distinct, and while appearing as the "first-born of every creature," still on the other hand appears also as the only begotten Son of the living God, or as eternal personal emanation from the Divine essence. The hypostatic Hhokmah of our author (and also the Σοφία of the Apocrypha, which differs from it in no essential characteristic) appears accordingly as an imperfect introduction and preparation for the idea of the Logos in the New Testament, the conception not having yet reached a full symmetrical development. So also the "Spirit of God" in the prophetic literature of the O. T. shows itself to be the prototype, the germinal basis for the πνεῦμα ἅγιον of the N. T., this distinctly personal third Divine agent in salvation, with the Father and the Son.*

In any event, however, this conception stands much nearer to the idea of the Logos or the Son in the New Testament, and contributed more directly to its development, than that personification of the creative "word of Jehovah" which appears here and there in Psalmists and prophets (*e. g.*, Ps. xxxiii. 6; cxlvii. 15; Is. lv. 11, *etc.*). For this last expression has, after all, no other value than poetic figures in general, hastily thrown out. The Hhokmah of our passage, however, is, notwithstanding the poetic character of its drapery, a conception developed with the greatest care, a fruit of profound and consecrated speculation, a bright ray of Divine revelation, which, among the Messianic prophecies of the O. T. that relate to the Divine side of the Redeemer's nature, holds one of the most conspicuous places. Comp. NITZSCH, as above cited, pp. 319, 320.

[5. The error in our English exegetical and theological literature with respect to our passage has been, we think, the attempt to force upon it more of distinctness and precision in the revelation of the mysteries of the Divine nature than is disclosed by a fair exegesis. Sometimes it is the doctrine of the Logos that is made to stand out with all the clearness of the New Testament announcement; sometimes it is "the eternal generation of the Son" that Solomon is made, as the Spirit's mouthpiece, to reveal. OWEN's elaborate arguments (Comm. on the Epistle to the Hebrews, Exercitation xxvii.), and HOLDEN's extended and learned comments (Comm. *in loc.*), appear to us very plainly to err in this excess. If it be not unworthy of the Holy Spirit to employ a bold and graphic personification, many things in this chapter may be said of and by the personified Wisdom, which these and other similar authors regard as triumphantly proving that we have here the pre-existent Christ, the Son of God. How weak would that personification be which did not ascribe to the imagined person *hate, love, power, etc.* (see HOLDEN)! Why cannot a personified attribute, if the personification be at all successful, be represented as being born, as being by or near the Deity, as rejoicing in His sight, *etc.* (see HOLDEN again)? And yet we need not

* We here presuppose the spurious character of the ἐκκλησίας (which, besides, was early expunged by the correctors of the text) standing in the place of κτίσεως in the *Cod. Sin.* If this remarkable reading were genuine, the meaning of the expression would certainly be altogether different. But the assumption can hardly be avoided that there is here an attempted emendation in the interest of the Antimonarchians or Anti-arians.

* Comp. also subsequent notes on ch. xxx. 3 sq.

Digitized by Google

go so far as OWEN and say, "A personal transaction before the creation of the world, between the Father and the Son, acting materially by their One Spirit, concerning the state and condition of mankind, with respect to Divine love and favor, is that which we inquire after, and which is here fully expressed." WORDSWORTH not agreeing with GESENIUS, *etc*. in regard to the primary meaning of the much debated קָנָה* admitting that it originally signifies *acquire*, nevertheless agrees with GESEN., HUPFELD (?), NOYES, STUART and others in here rendering it "created," because he wants an "eternal generation" as the product of his exegesis,—a product far enough from the thoughts of most of those who agree with him in his rendering. We can, to say the least, go no farther than our author has done in discovering here the foreshadowings of the doctrine of the Logos. We are inclined to prefer the still more guarded statements, *e. g.*, of Dr. J. PYE SMITH (*Scripture Testimony to the Messiah*, I., 352), that this beautiful picture "cannot be satisfactorily proved to be a designed description of the Saviour's person;" or that of Dr. JOHN HARRIS (Sermon on Prov. viii. 30-36). "At all events, while, on the one hand, none can *demonstrate* that Christ is here directly intended,—on the other, none can *prove* that He is not contemplated; and perhaps both will admit that under certain conditions language such as that in our text may be justifiably applied to Him. One of these conditions is, that the language be not employed *argumentatively*, or in *proof* of any thing relating to Christ, but only for the purpose of illustration; and another is that when so employed, it be only adduced to illustrate such views of the Son of God as are already established by such other parts of Scripture as are admitted by the parties addressed."—A.]

HOMILETIC AND PRACTICAL.

Homily on the entire chapter. See the translation above, and comp. STÖCKER: The heavenly Wisdom which is the word of God is urgently commended to us: 1) by the good opportunity which we have to study it (vers. 1-5); 2) by the rich blessing that it brings us (vers. 6-21); 3) by the eminence and majesty of the teacher who teaches it, and who is no other than Christ, the eternal Son of God (vers. 22-36).—STARKE: The true Wisdom's invitation of all men to the Kingdom of God: 1) the invitation itself (vers. 1-10); 2) the inducements to give heed to it, namely: *a*) the inestimable value of wisdom (vers. 11, 12); *b*) the blessings of those who accept her invitation to the Kingdom of God (vers. 13-36).—*Calwer Handbuch*: Wisdom commends herself: 1) in general (vers. 1-5); 2) by her truthfulness (vers. 6-9); 3) by the prudence, understanding, honor and power that she imparts to her followers (vers. 10-21); 4) by her eternal existence, her participation in the creation, her delight in the sons of men (vers. 22-36).—WOHLFARTH: Wisdom the truest and best friend of men, her doors (ver. 34) standing open day by day to every one that needs and desires her.

*[For a very full and candid discussion of this with other related points, see an article by Prof. E. P. BARROWS, *Biblioth. Sacra*, April, 1858; also, LIDDON'S *Bamp. Lectures*, pp. 60, 61.—A.]

Vers. 1-11. EGARD:—The Eternal Son of God gathers, plants, builds His Church by a voice, *i. e.*, His word. All true teachers of the word are crying voices through which Christ calls.—Out of Christ's school is no true wisdom; they who deem themselves wise and shrewd are unfitted to learn of Him.—So long as Christ's wisdom is still speaking outside of thee it avails thee nothing; but when thou allowest it to dwell in thee it is thy light and thy life.—Thou shouldst have one heart and one mouth with Christ; if false and perverse things are found in thy mouth thou art still far from Christ.—Silver and gold is mere vanity and nothingness; what can it help in the day of wrath and judgment? Let God's word be thy highest and best treasure.—*Berleb. Bible*: Wisdom (who speaks to us not only through the word written and preached, but also inwardly, as God's voice in our hearts) is so far from keeping silence, that although we stop our ears, we yet hear her correction within at the entrances and doors of the heart; and although we will not understand her, we must nevertheless feel her. And this is a testimony how desirous God is of our blessedness.

Vers. 12-21. MELANCHTHON (on vers. 14 sq.): Those counsels are just which agree with the word of God; and these counsels will at length have joyful issues, with the aid of the Son of God, who wills to aid those that continue in the word which He has given, and who call upon Him.—LUTHER (marginal comment on vers. 15, 16): "Princes should act, speak, work, honorably and praiseworthily, that men may glory in and follow their example; and not as the tyrants, the foul, the cyclops," *etc.*—HASIUS: When true wisdom is taken into counsel in every thing, then in all ranks that will occur which each one's purpose demands according to a perfect ideal. Kings, princes, nobles, counsellors will act in conformity with the aim of their calling (2 Chron. xix. 6, 7).—Things would stand much better in the world if men exercised their spirit more after holiness, and strove with greater zeal for wisdom, Matth. vi. 33.—*Berleburg Bible*: No one can rightfully take to himself the name of a Christian ruler, but he who subjects himself in spirit and truth, in humble obedience to the control of the Almighty, lays himself at His feet and allows himself to be wholly ruled by Him. Others exercise a rude, violent and tyrannical control, and an assumed authority over the person of men.—VON GERLACH: The wisdom who here announces herself is the very wisdom of God, and is therefore also, as all good can be from God alone, the soul of all good laws and ordinances (vers. 14-17), and must, as every thing earthly is ruled, disposed and rightly distributed among men by God, necessarily reward her disciples with welfare, honor and riches (vers. 18-21). [Ver. 12. CHARNOCK: All arts among men are the rays of Divine wisdom shining upon them. Whatsoever wisdom there is in the world, it is but a shadow of the wisdom of God.—Ver. 13. ARNOT: To fear retribution is not to hate sin; in most cases it is to love it with the whole heart. It is when sin is forgiven that a sinner can hate it. Then he is on God's side. Instead of hating God for his holiness, the forgiven man instinctively loathes the evil of his

Digitized by Google

own heart.—JONA. EDWARDS: "The affection of hatred as having sin for its object is spoken of in Scripture as no inconsiderable part of true religion. It is spoken of as that by which true religion may be known and distinguished."—Ver. 15. Bp. SANDERSON: On the efficient cause and consequent obligation of human law.—HOOKER: "By me kings reign," *etc.* Not as if men did behold that book and accordingly frame their laws; but because it worketh in them, because it discovereth and (as it were) readeth itself to the world by them, when the laws which they make are righteous.—Ver. 18. ARNOT: The riches which the King of saints imparts along with the patent of nobility to support its dignity withal, are linked to righteousness and last forever. Handfuls are gotten on the ground, but a soulful is not to be had except in Christ.]

Vers. 22-31. GEIER:—From this delineation there follows: 1) the personal difference of the Son from the Father; 2) the essential likeness of the Son to the Father, as partaker of the Divine activity in creation; 3) the unutterable love of the Father to the Son (ver. 30?); 4) the deep and grateful love which we in turn owe to this Divinely loved director and mediator in creation and redemption.—ZELTNER: All the works of God's omnipotence and wisdom thou shouldst contemplate with holy joy and wonder, praise the Creator for them, and with them strengthen thyself in faith in His paternal providence.—As an essential and indescribable fellowship exists between the Father and the Son, so does there exist between God and the believer a gracious spiritual union, on which the Christian must be most intent.—STARKE: All things have had their beginning except the Son of God regarded in His Divine nature. He is with the Father and the Holy Ghost true God from everlasting to everlasting. All that this Eternal Wisdom does in the kingdom of nature, as well as in that of grace, she does with gladness and delight: yea, there is in this work so lovely and wise an alternation and manifoldness, that we must in reason wonder at it (comp. Eph. iii. 10, "the manifold wisdom of God"). — VON GERLACH: — That "play" of wisdom in which the Lord takes pleasure, and her joyousness on the earth, in which she finds her joy among men, points to the childlike gladness of the love that ruled in creation, and to the confidential relation into which the children of wisdom on earth (Matth. xi. 19) enter, to her the very wisdom of God; comp. Prov. x. 23. In this passage there is a most clearly prophetic gleam of the light of the New Testament; God's eternal wisdom comes forth from Him that He may delight Himself in her activity; His own eternal nature the Father for his own blessedness contemplates in the Son. And it is in a love most intimately blended with wisdom that the Father created the world, to His own blessedness and that of His creatures.

Vers. 32-36. GEIER: The true fruits of obedience should follow the hearing of the word. To these belong: 1) walking the prescribed way; 2) willing reception of the Divine correction: 3) the extirpation of all inner opposition; 4) zealous and persistent seeking after salvation; 5) thankful enjoyment of the true wisdom when found.—VON GERLACH (on vers. 34 sq.): Wisdom here appears as a sovereign, separate and secluded in the style of Oriental monarchs, so that only those know any thing of her who diligently keep watch at her doors. Wisdom, who is universal in her call and invitation (vers. 1-3), yet in the course of communication, in order to test the fidelity of her admirers, veils herself at times in a mysterious darkness, and reveals herself only to those who never intermit their search (Matth. vii. 7).—[JOHN HOWE: There ought to be an expectation raised in us that the vital savor diffused in and by the word may reach us; and many are ruined for not expecting it, not waiting at the posts of wisdom's door.—TRAPP: Hear, *etc.* This way wisdom enters into the soul. Hear, therefore, for else there is no hope; hear, howsoever.—FLAVEL: It is good to lie in the path of the Spirit.]

---

15. Allegorical exhibition of the call of men to the possession and enjoyment of true wisdom, under the figure of an invitation to two banquets.

CHAP. IX. 1-18.

a) The banquet of wisdom: Vers. 1-12.

1 Wisdom hath builded her house,
she hath hewn out her seven pillars.
2 hath slaughtered her beasts, spiced her wine,
hath also spread her table;
3 hath sent out her maidens; she inviteth
on the highest points (summits of the high places) of the city:
4 "Whosoever is simple, let him come hither!"—
Whoso lacketh understanding, to him she saith:

Digitized by Google

5 "Come, eat of my bread
and drink of the wine I have mixed!
6 Forsake the simple, and live,
and walk in the way of understanding.
7 He who correcteth a scorner draweth upon himself insult,
and he who rebuketh the wicked, it is his dishonor.
8 Reprove not the scorner lest he hate thee;
admonish the wise and he will love thee.
9 Give to the wise and he becometh yet wiser,
instruct the upright and he learneth yet more.
10 The beginning of wisdom is the fear of Jehovah,
and knowledge of the Holy (one) is understanding.
11 For by me will thy days become many,
and the years of thy life will increase.
12 Art thou wise, thou art wise for thyself,
and if thou scornest thou alone shalt bear it."

b) The banquet of Folly: Vers. 13–18.

13 A simple woman (and) clamorous,
is Folly, and knoweth nothing whatsoever.
14 She sitteth at the door of her house
enthroned in the high places of the city,
15 to invite the wayfarers
who go straight on their ways:
16 "Whosoever is simple let him come hither!"—
whoso lacketh understanding to him she saith:
17 "Stolen waters are sweet,
and bread taken in secret is pleasant,"
18 and he knoweth not that the dead are there,
in the depths of hell (the lower world) her guests.

GRAMMATICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 3. [BÖTTCHER cites מְרֹמֵי as illustrating a peculiar Hebrew idiom by which the emphatic plural of generic designations of persons, places and things is used for the singular with an indefinite article, which the Hebrew lacked, and only in its later periods began to supplement by the numeral. He would therefore translate "on one of the high places of the city." See *Ausführl. Lehrb.*, § 702, *d.*].

Vers. 4. [יָסֻר, an example of the "consultive" use of the Jussive form (see BÖTT. § 964, 2), which under the influence of the succeeding word retains the *u* vowel (§ 956, *g*,—§ 1132, 3), the ordinary Jussive being יָסֹר. אָמְרָה Perf. consec. employed, as it sometimes is in the lively discourse of oratory and poetry, without the connective וְ, B. § 974].

Ver. 9. [וְיוֹסֶף, וִיהָכַם, examples of Jussive with וְ consec., in the "*consecutive-affirmative*" sense, as giving an assured result. BÖTT. § 964, *a.*].

Ver. 13. [מָה is regarded by BÖTTCHER also as an indefinite, *quidquid* or *quidquam*, (§ 899, *e*), as it is by GESENIUS and FUERST. GESEN. however finds a different shade of meaning in the verb, and translates "and careth for nothing"].

Ver. 16. [וְאָמְרָה, an example of the Perf. consec. in the sense of the "*Fiens solitum*," the "future" with the idea of customary action. BÖTT. § 981, B. *β*.].

EXEGETICAL.

1. Vers. 1-3. **Wisdom hath builded her house.** The figure of the building of a house which is readily suggested by the appellation "director of the work" in chap. viii. 30, appropriately provides for a transition from the description of the agency of eternal Wisdom in the creation of the world, to that here symbolized as an invitation to a banquet,—her activity among men, summoning and morally instructing them. Comp. chap. xiv. 1.—The designation of Wisdom (חָכְמוֹת) is the same as in i. 20.—**Hath hewn out her seven pillars.** This hewing out of pillars suggests the splendor of the completed building. The sevenfold number represents this as a sacred work; for seven stands here, as it so frequently does in the Old and New Testaments, as a sacred number (comp. my article "*Siebenzahl*" in HERZOG'S *Theol. Real-Encycl.*, XIV. 353 sq.). The house of the celestial Wisdom is by this peculiar and emblematic description represented, as it were, in advance, as a temple, and the banquet offered in it as a sacred sacrificial meal. Special significance in the seven pillars, *e. g.*, in connection with the seven attributes of the higher wisdom enumerated in James iii. 17; or the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit referred to in Rev. i. 4, 12 sq.; iii. 1; iv. 5; v. 6, *etc.* (VI-

Digitized by Google

TRINGA, C. B. MICHAELIS, J. LANGE, VON GERLACH, *etc.*), or the seven *principia deductiva Ethices divinæ* (according to S. BOHLIUS, comp. remarks above, p. 74, note), or finally, the first seven chapters of the Book of Wisdom now before us,—all this is indicated by nothing whatever in the context, and is therefore wholly arbitrary. The suffix in עַמּוּדֶיהָ, since בַּיִת is usually masc., seems to refer to Wisdom as the subject of the proposition,—*her*, not *its* seven pillars.

Ver. 2. **Hath slaughtered her beasts.** Notwithstanding the sacred character of the banquet, טִבְחָהּ is still not to be necessarily translated "her victims," but signifies "that which is slaughtered," slain animals in general. There is probably no reference to vii. 14.—The "mixing of the wine" seems not to refer to a mere mixing of wine with water, but to the preparation of a strong spiced wine with myrrh, *etc.*; comp. Isa. v. 22; Prov. xxiii. 30, *etc.*

Ver. 3. She inviteth on the highest points of the city, *i. e.*, so that her servants must ascend the highest elevations of the city (not specifically the roofs of palaces), from which their calls of invitation to the banquet are most widely heard. HITZIG singularly translates "on the bare elevations of the city," because גַּפִּים in Exod. xxi. 3, 4, and according to the Arabic, means naked, unclothed (?).—Furthermore the maidens sent forth, the servants of Wisdom, correspond to the servants by whom the Lord in the Gospel (Luke xiv. 16 sq.; Matth. xxii. 1 sq.) has the guests invited to his banquet.

2. Vers. 4-12. "**Whosoever is simple let him come hither!**" *etc.* On account of the similarity of this verse to ver. 16, which contains the words of Folly's invitation, and on account of the summons to eat *bread* (ver. 5) which does not agree with the mention of the slain beasts in ver. 2, HITZIG pronounces vers. 4 and 5 spurious. But it is very significant and pertinent that Wisdom's invitation appears clothed in the same words as that of Folly (comp. the analogous verbal repetitions in Christ's parables and didactic narratives, *e. g.*, Matth. xxv. 20, 22; Luke v. 6, 9; xvi. 6, 7, *etc.*); and to "eat bread" stands here as in iv. 7, and indeed frequently (*e g.*, Gen. iii. 19; Lev. xxvi. 5; Deut. xxix. 6; Judges xix. 5; 1 Sam. ii. 36, *etc.*), by synecdoche for "the partaking of food, the taking a meal" in general. [The allegorical view of this passage as held, *e. g.*, by WORDSW., and in his Commentary supported by ample use of the Church Fathers, may be illustrated by the supposed reference of ver. 5 to "the Body of Christ, the Living Bread, and the mystery of His blood, by which we are refreshed at His Holy Table." A.].—**The destitute of understanding, to him she saith.** Before the חֲסַר־לֵב there is to be supplied from the 1st member the pronoun מִי,—literally, therefore "who is destitute of understanding, to him she saith." The discourse accordingly here (and in the 2d member of ver. 15) falls back from the style of recital to that of description.

Ver. 6. **Forsake the simple.** It will be easiest to take this phrase in its literal sense. For the verses following give this very counsel, not to keep company longer with the simple, with fools and scorners, because these are still incorrigible. The old versions and most modern commentators [as *e. g.*, ST., N., M.] regard the noun as abstract (equivalent to the sing. פֶּתִי in i. 22, or the abstract derivative פְּתַיּוּת in ver. 18), and therefore translate "Forsake simplicity, let your simplicity go." [As TRAPP, in his pithy way expresses it: "No coming to this feast in the tattered rags of the old Adam; you must relinquish your former evil courses and companies"]. But such a signification of this plural is attested by no example whatsoever. Just as unadvisable is it to construe the verb absolutely, by which HITZIG reaches the translation, "Cease, ye simple," *etc.*; for in Jer. xviii. 14, the verb is construed not absolutely, but rather with מִן; and the connection with what follows at least decidedly favors our explanation, which is supported by UMBREIT also among others of the later expositors.

Ver. 7. **He who correcteth the scorner draweth upon himself insult.** Usually the connection with ver. 4-6 is so conceived as if Wisdom were here (in ver. 7-10) explaining her conduct in inviting especially the simple; she is supposed to turn to these alone, for the reason that if she wished to invite the scornful and wicked also she would only expose herself to indignities, and yet would effect nothing. But against this view of the course of thought may be urged decidedly, the warning and admonitory tone of vers. 8, 9, and the didactic nature of ver. 10, which make it easy to find expressed in ver. 7 also the spirit of dissuasion, and so to regard vers. 7-10 as an argument in support of the demand embodied in the 1st clause of ver. 6, to avoid further intercourse with the simple, scorners, villains, *etc.* A comparison with i. 22 shows that under the "simple" may be included very readily mockers, the violent, *etc.*, as belonging to the same category; so does also the name "simplicity" (פְּתַיּוּת) which is below, in ver. 18, directly given to the personification of Folly. "Abandon intercourse with such persons" is therefore Wisdom's admonition, "for you gain from it nothing but insult, hate and contempt; forsake the camp of the simple (פְּתָאִים) and come over into that of the wise (חֲכָמִים), whose watchword is the fear of God and knowledge of the Holy; so will you find abundance of happiness and blessing."—HITZIG, whose conception of the 1st clause of ver. 6 makes the recognition of this as the true connection of thought from the first impossible, summarily rejects ver. 7-10 as a later interpolation. But if in fact the "if thou scornest" in the 2d clause of ver. 12 suggested this interpolation, the verses introduced would both in form and substance have been essentially different. And in the form in which the passage has come down in the manuscripts HITZIG's hypothesis of an interpolation here again finds no kind of support.—**And he who rebuketh a wicked man to him it is a shame.** The word מוּמוֹ (his fault or shame) cannot be dependent on the verb (לֹקֵחַ) of the first clause which is associated with לוֹ [he

taketh to himself his shame], but must be regarded as a predicate: "this is to him shame, such action is his disgrace." Comp. Eccl. v. 16; Ps. cxv. 7.

Ver. 9. **Give to the wise and he becometh wiser.** Comp. chap. i. 5, which passage although expressing an idea like that before us, must not for that reason be regarded as derived from this (in opposition to HITZIG). [Lord BACON (*Adv. of Learning*, Book II.) says, "Here is distinguished the wisdom brought into habit, and that which is but verbal and swimming only in conceit; for the one upon the occasion presented is quickened and redoubled, the other is amazed and confused"]. With ver. 10 comp. i. 7; ii. 5. Corresponding with the "Knowledge of God" in the latter passage we have here "knowledge of the holy," *i. e.* not "knowledge of the holy" [in plural] (LXX, Vulgate, and most Catholic expositors), but "of the Holy" [in singular, "*des Heiligen*"], *i. e.* of God. Comp. further for this *plur. majest.* chap. xxx. 3 and Hos. xii. 1. [See still further examples of the use of participial plurals in the same way in Isa. liv. 5; Ps. cxxi. 5; Eccl. xii. 1, *etc.*, EWALD, *Lehrb.*, § 178, *b*, BÖTT., § 701, GREEN, § 202.—With regard to the interpretation compare Dr. J. PYE SMITH (*Script. Test. to the Messiah*, I., 311): "According to the usual construction of Hebrew poetry, the plural epithet "the Holy" must be understood in apposition with JEHOVAH in the former half of the distich." So H., ST. M., and N.—A.]

Vers. 11, 12 are not to be regarded as taking up the discourse after the alleged digression in vers. 7-10, and attaching themselves to the words of invitation in vers. 4-6 to justify them (BERTHEAU, HITZIG), but give the reason for the general affirmation in ver. 10, which had been added as a peculiarly strong motive to the acceptance of Wisdom's invitation. The address in the singular has therefore nothing remarkable in it; it simply follows vers. 8, 9.—**By me will thy days become many**, *etc.* Comp. similar promises of long life, chap. iii. 2; iv. 10. [For the use of this 3d pers. plural יוֹסִיפוּ see the grammars generally, *e. g.* GES., § 134, 3; GREEN, § 243, 2, *b*, but more fully BÖTT., § 935, 6].—**Art thou wise, thou art wise to thyself.** The same thought is found somewhat more fully developed in Job xxii. 2, 3; xxxv. 6-9; comp. also Rom. xi. 35; Rev. xxii. 11, 12.—**If thou scornest thou alone shalt bear it.** Comp. Numb. ix. 13; Jer. vii. 19; Job xxxiv. 31, and also the Latin *dictum* of PETRONIUS, "*Sibi quisque peccat.*" The LXX offer in ver. 12, 1st clause, the fuller reading "thou shalt be wise for thyself and for thy neighbor" (καὶ τῷ πλησίον) which is surely the result of interpolation, like the addition which they append to ver. 10 (τὸ γὰρ γνῶναι νόμον διανοίας ἐστὶν ἀγαθῆς). The longer additions also of three verses each, which they with the Syriac and Arabic translators exhibit after ver. 12 and ver. 18, hardly rest upon a genuine original text that was before them, although they may readily be rendered back into Hebrew (see HITZIG's attempts at this, pp. 86 and 88), and therefore very probably date from pre-Alexandrian times.

Vers. 13-18. **A simple woman, clamorous, [violently excited] is Folly.** The abstract פְּתַיּוּת, simplicity, foolishness (see above remarks on ver. 7) is here plainly the subject, and designates the personified Folly, the exact opposite of Wisdom in ver. 1 With this subject is associated and prefixed as the main predicate, the appellation "woman of folly," *i. e.*, simple woman; the הֹמִיָּה "clamorous, boisterous" is in turn an attribute of this predicate, and describes the passionately excited, wanton desire of the foolish woman represented as an adulteress, just as in vii. 11, with which delineation that before us has a general and doubtless intentional correspondence.—**And knoweth nothing whatever.** In this way in accordance with Job xiii. 13, this phrase of the Masoretic text (וּבַל־יָדְעָה־מָּה) must unquestionably be interpreted. *Utter ignorance* (comp. John xi. 49, "ye know nothing at all") would accordingly be what is here asserted of Folly. But perhaps HITZIG is right, according to the LXX (ἡ οὐκ ἐπίσταται αἰσχύνην, "who knoweth not shame") in reading כְּלִמָּה instead of מָּה (the disappearance of the two consonants might easily have been occasioned by the false reading כָּל־מָה), and therefore in translating "and knoweth no shame," which agrees admirably with the "boisterous" of the 1st clause.

Ver. 14. **She sitteth at the door of her house**, like harlots who watch for passers by; comp. Jer. iii. 2; Gen. xxxviii. 14, and the conduct of the adulteress described in chap. vii. 10 sq.—**Seated in the high places of the city.** The place thus described is not the same as that in the 1st clause, but some other, farther removed from the door of the house. The harlot is therefore quite like the one in chap. vii. 10 sq., represented as running irregularly this way and that and often changing her place. In this, however, the representation accords with that in ver. 3; as Wisdom so also Folly sends forth her call of invitation from elevated places of the city (comp. also chap. viii. 2). A real throne as her seat, which she has erected under the open air, and which, in contrast to the "bald, uncovered heights" (?) mentioned in ver. 3, is supposed to be covered with tapestry (HITZIG), is certainly not intended; but the "throne" is here metaphorical; a "lofty throne of the city" (UMBREIT) is a figurative and probably an ironical representation of a specially high place on which the wanton harlot has stationed herself, and therefore is as it were enthroned.

Ver. 15. **Who go straight on their ways**, and therefore quiet, unwary travellers who take no thought of circuits or by-paths. The expression is doubtless to be taken literally, and yet not without a secondary moral significance.

Ver. 17. **Stolen waters are sweet**, *etc.* Plainly words of Folly, and not of the author (EWALD, BERTHEAU), or even of one who has been assailed and ensnared by Folly's allurements (ELSTER): for the suggestion of the attraction and charm of forbidden pleasures appears most appropriately in the mouth of the beguiler. Comp. UMBREIT on this passage. Instead of wine (ver. 5) water is here mentioned

Digitized by Google

as the ingredient of the feast, probably with reference to the waters mentioned in chap. v. 15.—**Bread of secrecy**, *i. e.* not simply bread secretly enjoyed, but also unjustly gained; an image of the forbidden enjoyment on which the adulterer seizes (comp. chap. xxx. 20).

Ver. 18. **And he knoweth not**, *i. e.* the foolish victim who heeds her call and enters her house (comp. viii. 22).—**That the dead** (shades) **are there**, *i. e.* children of death, who are surely moving on toward the horrors of the lower world, and therefore even now, while the body still lives, are tenants of the lower world (רְפָאִים, comp. ii. 18), or "dead" (thus quite correctly according to the sense, LUTHER [the English version, *etc.*]: comp. Matt. viii. 22; Eph. ii. 1, *etc.*)—**In the depths of hell her guests**; literally, "in the depths (not as UMBREIT and EWALD would read 'in the valleys') of Sheol her invited ones." Therefore although in the house of Folly and to be found at her banquet those ensnared by her are in truth already in hell. For that house as a throat of hell reaches down to it (comp. ii. 18; vii. 27), is as it were only a station on the way of these sinners, which leads surely and irresistibly down to hell. Thus, and doubtless correctly, HITZIG, in opposition to others who make this language only anticipative. As to the three verses which the LXX supply after ver. 18 see above on ver. 12.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL, HOMILETIC AND PRACTICAL.

The prototypical relation of the contents of this chapter to our Lord's parables founded on banquets (Mt. xxii. 1-14; Lu. xiv. 16-24) is evident, and therefore its special importance to the doctrine of the call to salvation. What peculiarly characterizes the representation before us is, however, the twofold banquet to which invitation is given, and the correspondent resemblances and differences in the two feasts with their accompaniments. In both instances, at Wisdom's feast as well as that of Folly, it is the "simple," *i. e.* the great mass of the unrenewed, the children of this world, those indeed needing but not yet partaking the divine salvation, to whom the call goes forth. It also goes in both cases (Ver. 4 and 16) with the same words of invitation, and under quite similar conditions,—that is, in such a way that those to be invited are laid hold upon in the street, and at once taken into the house (comp. Matt. xxii. 9; Luke xiv. 21). With these analogies which are found mainly at the beginning of the acts compared, how great are the differences, how fearful the contrasts! In the former case it is a splendid palace with its columns, a holy temple of God, in which the feast occurs; in the latter a common house, a harlot's abode, built over an entrance to the abyss of hell! In the first the entertainer, represented as the princely occupant of a palace, remains quietly at home, while her servants take charge of the invitations; in the last the common woman goes out herself on the streets and high places of the city, that sitting in the attire of a harlot (comp. vii. 10), with the open heavens as a canopy above her, she may craftily and shamelessly attract as many as may be affected and ensnared by the contagion of her wanton lust! In the former instance it is simple words of God that make up the inviting testimony, words that in part with a literal exactness agree with the gracious calls of mercy and love with which the Son of Man once called sinners to repentance (comp., for example, ver. 5 with John vi. 35, vers. 7, 8 with Matt. vii. 6; ver. 9 with Matt. xiii. 12; vers. 6, 11, 12 with Matt. xi. 28-30); in the latter it is a Satanic voice of temptation that is heard, setting forth with the boldest effrontery as a commendable principle to which we should conform our lives, the well-known "we ever strive for the forbidden, and desire the denied" (*nitimur in vetitum semper cupimusque negata*)! comp. ver. 17 with Matt. iv. 8, 9; Rom. i. 32, *etc.*

In the *homiletic treatment of the passage as a whole* it will be appropriate to set in the clearest light this parallelism of the banquets that are compared, with their special resemblances and contrasts; in some such way as this then: The friends of the kingdom of heaven and the friends of this world; or, The call of Christ to His Church, and the enticement of Satan to the service of sin; or, The feast of death, *etc.* Comp. STÖCKER: Christ's wisdom and humanity (φιλανθρωπία); Antichrist's folly and destructiveness.—STARKE:—A lesson on the founding of the church of the Messiah, and the collection of its members: 1) The founding of the Church by the work of redemption (vers. 1, 2). 2) The invitation to the enjoyment of the blessings of Christ's salvation in the Church; and in particular: *a*) How Christ invites to the enjoyment of these blessings of His salvation (vers. 3-6); *b*) How this invitation is foolishly despised by many men, and the allurements of sin preferred to it.—WOHLFARTH:—The cross-roads; while wisdom calls us to the way of virtue and offers herself as our guide on it, at the same time the pleasure of this world calls and offers everything imaginable to draw to itself earth's pilgrims of all races, ages and conditions.

Single passages. On vers. 1-6. STÖCKER:—(Sermon on Christmas eve); Christ's friendliness and condescension, as it appears 1) from the founding of His Church and its maintenance by "seven pillars," *i. e.* by the apostles endowed with the manifold gifts of the Holy Ghost (ver. 1); 2) from His costly work of redemption in His own sacrificial death (ver. 2); by the institution of the means of grace in His Word and Sacrament (vers. 2-3); 4) from the gracious invitation to partake of all this (vers. 4 sq.).

On vers. 7, 8. CRAMER:—In the office of the Christian ministry the function of discipline must also be especially maintained. It does not, however, produce uniform fruits; some reform, some are and continue scorners.—[Ver. 7. FLAVEL:—What we fear might turn to our benefit. The reproof given is duty discharged; and the retort in return is a fresh call to repentance for sin past, and a caution against sin to come.—Vers. 7-9. ARNOT:—Reproof—how to give it and how to take it. There should be jealousy for the Lord's honor, and compassion for men's souls like a well-spring ever in the heart; and then the outgoing effort should be with all the wisdom of the serpent and the harmlessness

Digitized by Google

of the dove. For rightly receiving reproof the rule is, be more concerned to get the benefit of the reproof than to wreak vengeance on the reprover.]

On ver. 7-12. *Calwer Handbuch;* Reflections on the reception which Wisdom's invitation finds among men; mockers answer it with derision; wise, *i. e.* God-fearing men, and such as continue in sanctification grow not only in wisdom, but also in outward prosperity: the gain is in every case ours, as the loss is the scorner's.—On vers. 11, 12. HASIUS:—Wisdom and virtue lose nothing by being reviled and defamed; he, however, inevitably loses who makes sport of them.—[T. ADAMS: —Wisdom is the mother of abstinence, and abstinence the nurse of health; whereas voluptuousness and intemperance (as the French proverb hath it) dig their own grave with their teeth.]

On vers. 13-18. STARKE:—If the temptation of Satan and his agents is so strong so much the more needful is it to try the spirits whether they be of God, and to beseech God that He will guide us in the right way. Alas! to many men in consequence of their corrupted taste in spiritual things there is more relish in the bread of vice and in draughts from the impure sloughs of the world, than in what is offered to them on the table of Jesus' grace.—*Berleburg Bible:*—The more faithfully one serves the world, the more he allows himself to be led by corrupt reason and gives ear to the fascinating voice of temptation, the more enamored he is of the deceitful harlot, so much the deeper will he sink into the lowest depths of hell . . . . Who would prefer hell to heaven! who would go after death that may attain life!—[Ver. 17. TRAPP:—Many eat that on earth that they digest in hell.—ARNOT: —When you have tasted and seen that the Lord is gracious, the foolish woman beckons you toward her stolen waters, and praises their sweets in vain: the new appetite drives out the old].

II. ORIGINAL NUCLEUS OF THE COLLECTION—GENUINE PROVERBS OF SOLOMON.

Ethical maxims, precepts and admonitions with respect to the most diverse relations of human life.

(Proverbs mainly in the form of antithetic distichs.)

CHAP. X. 1—XXII. 16.

1. *Exhibition of the difference between the pious and the ungodly, and their respective lots in life.*

Chap. X-XV.

a) Comparison between the pious and the ungodly with respect to their life and conduct in general. Chap. X.

1 Proverbs of Solomon.
A wise son maketh glad his father,
but a foolish son is the grief of his mother.
2 Treasures of wickedness do not profit,
but righteousness delivereth from death.
3 Jehovah will not suffer the righteous to famish [E. V.: the soul of the righteous],
but the craving of the wicked He disappointeth.
4 He becometh poor that worketh with an idle hand,
but the hand of the diligent maketh rich.
5 He that gathereth in summer is a wise son,
but he that sleepeth in harvest is a bad son.
6 Blessings are upon the head of the just,
but the mouth of the wicked hideth violence.
7 The memory of the just is blessed,
but the name of the wicked shall rot.
8 Whoso is wise in heart will receive precepts,
but he who is of foolish lips shall fall.
9 He that walketh uprightly walketh securely,
but he that perverteth his way shall be made known.

Digitized by Google

10 He that winketh with the eye causeth trouble,
and he that is of foolish lips is overthrown.
11 A fountain of life is the mouth of the righteous,
but the mouth of the wicked hideth violence.
12 Hate stirreth up strife,
but love covereth all transgressions.
13 On the lips of the man of understanding wisdom is found,
but a rod (is) for the back of the fool.
14 Wise men store up knowledge,
but the mouth of the fool is a near (speedy) destruction.
15 The rich man's wealth is his strong city,
the destruction of the poor is their poverty.
16 The labour of the righteous (tendeth) to life,
the gain of the wicked to sin.
17 A way to life is he who heedeth correction,
he who resisteth reproof leadeth astray.
18 He that hideth hatred (hath) lying lips,
and he who spreadeth slander is a fool.
19 In much talking transgression is not wanting,
but he that governeth his lips doeth wisely.
20 Choice silver is the tongue of the righteous,
the heart of the wicked is of little worth.
21 The lips of the righteous feed many,
but fools die for want of knowledge.
22 Jehovah's blessing,—it maketh rich,
and labour addeth nothing thereto.
23 It is as sport to a fool to do mischief,
but to the man of understanding wisdom.
24 What the wicked feareth cometh upon him,
but the desire of the righteous is granted them.
25 When a storm sweepeth by the wicked is no more,
but the righteous is an everlasting foundation.
26 As vinegar to the teeth and smoke to the eyes,
so is the sluggard to them that send him.
27 The fear of Jehovah multiplieth days,
but the years of the wicked are shortened.
28 The expectation of the righteous is gladness,
but the hope of the wicked shall perish.
29 Jehovah's way is a bulwark to the righteous,
but destruction to evil doers.
30 The righteous shall never be moved,
but the wicked shall not abide in the land.
31 The mouth of the righteous bringeth forth wisdom,
but the perverse tongue shall be rooted out.
32 The lips of the righteous know what is acceptable,
but the mouth of the wicked perverseness.

GRAMMATICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1.—[יְשַׂמַּח; cited by Böтт (§§ 943, *c*, *e*; 950 *e*) as an illustration of the employment of the Imperf. to express what must be from the very nature of the case,—*Fiens debitum*,—"must gladden."—A.]

Ver 2.—[יוֹעִילוּ: as above, with the meaning "cannot profit;" § 950, *c*, *β*.—A.]

Ver. 3.—[יַרְעִיב; an example of the *Fiens solitum*, what is *wont* to be; § 950, *b*.]—The LXX, arbitrarily assimilating the language of the first and second clauses, read in the second חַיַּת רְשָׁעִים, for they translate "the life of the ungodly," ζωὴν δὲ ἀσεβῶν ἀνατρέψει. [הַוָּה has been quite variously rendered. The E. V. translates "substance," the object of the desire of the wicked. Luther, following the *insidias* of the Vulg., renders by "*Schinderei*—*exactions* or *oppression*. Holden translates "iniquity." N., St., and M. agree with our author in retaining the simple meaning "craving, or greedy desire." So Gesen., Fuerst, *etc*.—A.]

Ver. 5.—[מֵבִישׁ is taken by Gesen., Fuerst, Stuart as intransitive, in the sense of "acting basely." N., M., H. agree

Digitized by Google

with the E. V in deriving it from a different radical idea in the verb, and making it a causative Hiphil. The difference in the final import is not very great, yet the former conception of the word appears to have the best warrant.—A.]

Ver. 8.—[יִקַּח, *Fiens licitum*, "is disposed to receive," *etc.* Bött, § 950, *c*.—A.]

Ver. 21.—חֲסַר is here *stat. constr.* not of the adj. חָסֵר, as *e. g.* above in ver. 13, but of the noun חֹסֶר, as the old translators correctly judged. Bertheau is therefore wrong in rendering "through one void of understanding." Fuerst takes our author's view; so Bött. (§ 794), who would interpret ver. 10 in the same way, "the back of folly."—A.]

EXEGETICAL.

1. *General preliminary remark.* The main division of the collection of proverbs that begins with chap. x., by the scattered isolation and the mosaic-like grouping of its individual elements contrasts quite strongly with the longer and well compacted proverbial discourses of the first nine chapters. And yet one would go too far in assuming an entirely planless and unregulated accumulation of the proverbs contained in chaps. x.-xxii., and failing to recognize at least an attempt of the collector to secure a methodical grouping of the rich store of maxims that he has to communicate. Hitzig's assumption, it is true, seems altogether artificial, and tenable only as the result of violent critical dealing,—*viz.*, that chaps. x.-xxi. may be resolved into four sections of equal length, of about 90 verses each; 1) chaps. x.-xii. (xiii. 1 making a commencement parallel to x. 1); chap. xiii.-xv. 32 (in which division xiii. 23 is to be stricken out to make 91 verses, as in the preceding section); chap. xv. 33–xix. 3 (where by omitting xvi. 25 and inserting two verses from the LXX after xvi. 17 the number of 89 verses must be reached that shall correspond with the section following); and chap. xix. 4–xxi. 31. He also assumes that within these four principal subdivisions groups of verses symmetrically constructed of six, seven and eight verses respectively, succeed one another. But although such a construction according to definite relations of numbers is not demonstrable, or at least is demonstrable only in single instances (*e. g.*, chap. xv. 33—xvi. 15; see remarks on this passage), still the existence of larger or smaller groups of proverbs of similar import cannot be denied; and many of these groups relating to one and the same subject are very probably attached one to another according to a definite plan or construction of ideas. And yet these in most cases stand in a loose co-ordination, and withal quite frequently appear accompanied or interspersed by single verses that are altogether isolated. In the chapter before us groups of this sort, governed by a certain unity of idea, may be found in vers. 2-7, 8-10, 11-14, 15-21, 22-25, 27-30. Vers. 1, 26, 31, 32 stand isolated. Hitzig's attempt to construct from x. 1—xi. 8 exactly five groups of seven proverbs each appears untenable after an unprejudiced examination of the real relations of the matter.—With reference to the contents of the six groups of verses, together with the individual verses accompanying them, and also with respect to central thoughts that may possibly be drawn from these elements, see the "Doctrinal and Ethical" notes.

2. Vers. 1. **A wise son maketh glad his father,** *etc.*—This thought, which is quite general, is plainly designed to serve as an introduction to the entire collection of proverbs that succeeds; comp. i. 8. As in that instance, and as in xv. 20; xvii. 25; xxiii. 24 there is found here an attempt, by means of an antithetic parallelism, at *Metalepsis* or the distribution of the propositions between father and mother in detail. [Ingenious expositions of the diverse effects of different kinds of conduct upon the father and the mother, like that of Lord Bacon in the "*Advancement of Learning*," and more elaborately in the "*De Augmentis Scientiarum*," overlook the nature of the Hebrew parallelism—A.] "Grief, anxiety," derived from יָגָה (*moestus esse, dolere*), LXX : λύπη; comp. xiv. 13; xvii. 21; Ps. cxix. 28.

3. Vers. 2-7. Six verses or three pairs of verses relating to the earthly lot of the just and the unjust, the diligent and the sluggish.—**Treasures of wickedness profit not.**—Because they cannot avert the sudden and unhappy death that awaits the wicked; comp. vers. 25-27. With the second clause compare chap. xi. 4-19.

Ver. 3. **Jehovah will not suffer the righteous to famish.**—Literally, "the spirit of the righteous;" for this is the sense which in agreement with most interpreters we must find here, and not "the desire, the craving of the righteous," as Elster thinks, appealing for confirmation to vi. 30; xxiii. 2. For this strong expression is inappropriate before we come to the antithesis in the second member, and here the idea is plainly enough expressed by the word הַוָּה, "longing" (comp. אַוָּה, Deut. xii. 15; 1 Sam. xxiii. 20). Compare xi. 6.

Ver. 4. **He becometh poor that worketh with an idle hand.**—כַּף־רְמִיָּה, not a "deceitful, crafty hand," but an "idle, sluggish hand," *manus remissa* (Vulg.); comp. xii. 24, 27; xix. 15; Jer. xlviii. 10.—רָאשׁ, for which the LXX and Vulg. must have read רֵאשׁ the substantive (*πενία, egestas*), is the third Sing. Perf. Kal [or the participle] with the *scriptio plena* (like קָאם in Hos. x. 14), and with the signification "he is impoverished," *inops fit;* comp. Ps. xxxiv. 10. With the phrase עָשָׂה יָד, to stir the hand, to work with the hand, comp. Jer. xlviii. 10.—**But the hand of the diligent**—literally, "of the sharpened," comp. xii. 24.

Ver. 5. **He that gathereth in summer is a wise man**—lit., "is a son that doeth wisely," and so in the second member, "a son that doeth badly." These same predicates stand contrasted also in chap. xiv. 35, in that case to define more closely the term "servant," but here as attributes of the "son," which designation is chosen in this instance rather than "man," probably because "the heavy labors of the field which are here spoken of devolve especially upon the younger men, and also because idleness is particularly ruinous to youth" (Elster).—For the general sentiment comp. also chap. vi. 8, 9.

Ver. 6. **Benedictions (come) upon the head**

Digitized by Google

of the just, but the mouth of the wicked hideth violence.—In this strictly literal rendering of the verse there is no sharp antithesis between the first and second clauses, for which reason many, following the LXX and Vulg., reverse the relation of subject and object in the second clause, and either translate with DÖDERLEIN, DATHE, *etc.*, "wickedness closeth the mouth of the vicious," or, inasmuch as the noun חָמָס cannot possibly be used in this sense of "wickedness, evil disposition," explain with UMBREIT among others, "the mouth of the profligate crime covereth." [E. V.: "violence covereth the mouth of the wicked."] (This is substantially the explanation of HITZIG also, except that he points יְכֻסֶּה instead of יְכַסֶּה, and takes the noun חָמָס contrary to usage in the sense of "pain, ruin;" "the mouth of the wicked is covered with sorrow.") [WORDS. gives a doubtful support to this view.] But why in just this passage and the second hemistich of ver. 11 which corresponds literally with it, it should be particularly the *mouth* and not the *face* of the wicked that is named as the object to be covered with crime, is not readily seen; and to read "face" (פְּנֵי) instead of "mouth" (פִּי) in accordance with Ps. xliv. 16; Jer. li. 51, would evidently not answer on account of the double occurrence of the expression. Therefore, with BERTHEAU, ELSTER, *etc.* [N., ST., and M. in a qualified way], we should hold fast the above explanation as the simplest and most obvious, and accordingly reckon our verse among the exceptions, which, moreover, are not very rare, to that antithetic mode of constructing propositions which altogether predominates in the division of the book now before us. [RUEETSCHI, in the *Stud. und Krit.*, 1868, I., 135, not only agrees with our author in his construction of the verse, but endeavors more fully to justify the parallelism by the following explanation. "While the righteous, who is himself for others a fountain of life and blessing (ver. 11), nothing but love and fidelity, is himself also to expect blessing (ver. 7), the wicked has in himself only destruction; he hides it, covers it, it is true (comp. כִּסָּה, ver. 18), with his mouth, yet has it in him (Ps. v. 9); and this very fact, that he covers in himself ruin for others, turns the blessing away from him."]

Ver. 7. **The name of the wicked rotteth**, strictly "will rot or moulder," *i. e.*, the memory of the wicked not only disappears quickly and surely, but also so as to excite sensations of abhorrence and disgust in other men (like ill smelling mould).

4. Vers. 8-10. Three proverbs bearing upon the contrast between wise men and fools.—**He who is of foolish lips is overthrown.**—With the wisely *disposed* (in the first clause) there is significantly contrasted the foolish *speaker*, the froward *talker*, and that, too, with the designation suggested by the organ of his foolish discourse, "the fool in lips." The verb (יִלָּבֵט), for the most part misunderstood by the older translators, can express only the meaning of being brought to a downfall, being overthrown, *præcipitari*, and accordingly sets forth the consequence of that refusal to receive commandments which characterizes the fool in contrast with the wise man.

8

To secure a stronger antithesis to the verb of the first clause HITZIG reads יְלַבֵּט or יְלֻבַּט, "casts them away," *i. e.* the commandments. But it is precisely the correspondence with the 2d clause of ver. 10, where HITZIG must admit the passive meaning of the verb, that makes it certain that this is here also the intended meaning; for such verbal repetitions of whole or of half verses are among the fancies of the author of this division of our book; see above, remarks on ver. 6. [The wise "speaks little, but hears much: receives commands; therefore it goes well with him" (ver. 9, 1st clause; chap. iii. 1 sq.); but he "who is of foolish lips," who by his words shows himself a fool, is ever talking and not receiving instruction, is ruined; literally, is overthrown. It is in general a peculiar charm of many proverbs that the parallelism is not perfectly close, but it remains the function of the reader to seek out the intermediate thoughts, and to make the deductions." RUEETSCHI, as cited above].

Ver. 9. **Is made manifest**, lit., "is made known," *i. e.* as a sinner deserving punishment; an allusion to the judicial strictness of God, the All-seeing, [so WORDSW.], (the verb, therefore, not used as in chap. xii. 16). HITZIG strangely renders "made wiser," as though the Niphal were here passive of the Hiphil. [RUEETSCHI again (as cited above, p. 136) agrees with ZÖCKLER, and thus develops the antithesis: "he adopts crooked ways in order, as he thinks, to be able to practice iniquity more secure and unobserved; but he is ever known and exposed, he must himself always fear recognition, and this gives to his walk 'insecurity'"].

Ver. 10. **He that winketh with the eye.** Comp. vi. 13, where as here the "winking with the eye" immediately follows the mention of crooked and perverse action. Instead of the 2d clause, which is identical with the 2d clause of ver. 8, and which here yields no antithetic parallelism to the 1st clause, KENNICOTT, DATHE, BERTHEAU, ELSTER prefer the very different reading of the LXX: ὁ δὲ ἐλέγχων μετὰ παῤῥησίας εἰρηνοποιεῖ (but he that rebuketh boldly maketh peace). This however appears rather to be an attempted emendation, the result of well-meaning reflection than the restoration of an original Hebrew text. We must here again assume a momentary departure of the poet from his ordinary strictly antithetical construction of his sentences. In connection with this, however, we are not to give to the verb יִלָּבֵט conjecturally the meaning of "stumbling" or of "groping blindly" (HITZIG), but that which is found also in ver. 8, "having a fall," "self-destruction" (UMBREIT). [Here again RUEETSCHI comes to the defence of the poet's antithesis, with the explanation "he that winketh, the false, causes sorrow, produces vexation to himself, and he who in his folly openly utters evil falls." The results differ according to the nature of his wickedness; "vexation when he has done wrong secretly, overthrow, destruction, when he has done it openly" (as above cited, p. 136)].

5. Vers. 11–14. Two pairs of sentences concerning the contrast between good and evil, wisdom and folly, associated by the mention which

Digitized by Google

is common to the first and last proverb, of the *mouth* of those in whom the contrast appears (as the preceding group was characterized by the mention of the *lips* in vers. 8 and 10).—**A fountain of life is the mouth of the righteous**, on account of the hearty, edifying, loving character of its utterances. For this figure compare xiii. 14; xviii. 4. For the 2d clause see remarks above on ver. 6.

Ver. 12. **Hate stirreth up strife**, lit., "disputes," "litigations;" comp. vi. 14.—**All transgressions love covereth over**, by ignoring them, by palliating words, by considerate and conciliatory demeanor; comp. xvii. 9; James v. 20; 1 Pet. iv. 8; 1 Cor. xiii. 4.—[TRAPP: Love hath a large mantle].

Ver. 13. **A rod for the fool's back**, *i. e.* merited punishment overtakes him, the man void of understanding whose lips lack wisdom (comp. xxvi. 8; xix. 29). The imperfect and suggestive form of the antithesis is like that in vers. 6 and 8.

Ver. 14. **Wise men reserve knowledge**, lit., "conceal knowledge," *i. e.* husband the knowledge and understanding which they possess for the right time and place, do not squander it in unseasonable talk and babbling (comp. ver. 8). [So W., N., ST., and M.]. In the parallel passage xiii. 23 the synonymous verb to "cover" (כסה) corresponds with the one here used. Comp. also Mal. ii. 7.—**Is a near destruction**, *i. e.* is ever inclined to break forth with its foolish suggestions, and thereby to bring upon itself and upon others alarm and even destruction. Comp. the sentiment of chap. xiii. 8, which although indeed somewhat differently constructed is still in general similar. ["Near" is an adjective, and the rendering should be more distinct than the ambiguous and misleading translation of the E. V. The mouth of the wicked is not simply passively near to being destroyed; it is a quickly destroying agency.—A.]

6. Vers. 15-21. Seven proverbs mostly relating to earthly good, its worth, and the means of its attainment,—connected with the two preceding groups (although only loosely and externally) by the "destruction" of ver. 15, and the allusion to the lips in vers. 18 and 19. With the 1st clause of ver. 15 comp. xviii. 11; Ecclesiast. xl. 26; and Eccles. vii. 12.—**The destruction of the poor is their poverty**, *i. e.*, on account of their destitution there is every instant threatening them an utter destruction or the sundering of all their relations; they therefore come to nothing, they are continually exposed to the danger of a complete ruin in all their circumstances, while to the rich man his means secure a sure basis and a strong protection in all the vicissitudes of life. Naturally the author is here thinking of wealth well earned by practical wisdom; and this is at the same time a means in the further efforts of wisdom; and again, of a deserved poverty which while the consequence of foolish conduct, always causes one to sink deeper in folly and moral need. Comp. the ver. following. HITZIG here following Jer. xlviii. 39 takes this destruction (מחתה) subjectively, as equivalent to "consternation, terror," [NOYES], which view, however, is opposed by the use of the expression in the preceding verse and in ver. 29.

Ver. 16. **The labor of the righteous, his** acquisitions, his earnings, comp. 2 John 8.—**Tendeth to life**, comp. xi. 19 and also xvi. 8. The contrast to this, "tendeth to sin," includes the idea not fully expressed, "and accordingly to all misfortune and ruin as the result of sin." HITZIG, "to expiation," *i. e.* to making good the losses which his sins bring upon him as just penalties (with a reference to Zech. xiv. 19; Jer. xvii. 3); SCHULTENS, ARNOLDI, UMBREIT, *etc.*, "to downfall, to misfortune." Both expositions fail to conform to the usual signification of חטאת.

Ver. 17. **A way to life is he who heedeth correction.** "A way to life," (a well-known expression like "a way, or path of life" in chap. v. 6, and therefore not to be changed by a new punctuation into ארח לחיים, "a traveller to life," as ZIEGLER and EWALD propose); so the wise observer of good instruction is here named because he also guides others to life, in contrast with the מתעה, him who misleads, the despiser of wholesome discipline and correction, who not only fails of the right way himself, but shows himself an evil guide to others also (Matt. xv. 14). [The rendering of the E. V., "is in the way," although followed by H., N., M., W., is not full and exhaustive enough. Such a man is not merely "in the way to life;" he is a guide, by a bolder figure he is a way to other men.—A.] The intransitive conception of this participle (LXX, Vulg., LUTHER, and also UMBREIT, EWALD, *etc.*), may if necessary be reached by modifying the punctuation מתעה (Hithp., HITZIG); but the "going astray" even then does not correspond remarkably with the "way to life," so far as this expression is correctly understood. ["This sentence is an example how sometimes that which is simplest and most obvious can be persistently missed: these words so simple and true have been refined upon because the real idea was not taken. The meaning is simply this: example is efficacious;" *etc.* RUEETSCHI, as above, p. 187].

Ver. 18. **He that hideth hatred** (hath) **lying lips**, strictly, "is lips of falsehood," *i. e.* is a man of deceitful lips. [Here again the E. V. sacrifices much of the original. "Lying lips" is not here instrumental; it is the predicate. So H., N., S., M., W.—A.] Comp. for this immediate personification of the sinning organ, chap. xii. 19, 22, where in the first instance the "lying tongue" and then the "lying lips" appear personified. For the sentiment comp. xxvi. 24. Peculiarly hard and arbitrary is HITZIG's exposition; that instead of שקר (falsehood) we should read קשר (union), and that the expression thus resulting, "close, compressed lips" (?) is to be taken as the description of the deceitfully and maliciously compressed mouth of the man who is full of hate! EWALD is also arbitrary (although following the LXX); that instead of שקר we should read צדק (righteousness); "the lips of the righteous hide hatred," *i. e.* cover their enmity with love (?).—**He who spreadeth slander is a fool.** The meaning of this 2d clause does not stand in the relation of an antithesis to the preceding, but that of a

Digitized by Google

climax, adding a worse case to one not so bad. If one conceals his hatred within himself he becomes a malignant flatterer; but if he gives expression to it in slander, abuse and base detraction, then as a genuine fool he brings upon himself the greatest injury. [Rueetschi objects to this, 1) that the analogy of xii. 19, 22 does not justify our taking the expression "lying lips" in the 1st clause as the predicate, and 2) that the emphatic pronoun "he" (הוּא) in the 2d clause is still less intelligible on this view of the structure of the verse; he regards this rather as one of the instances, of no very rare occurrence, in which the two clauses make but one proposition, and renders, "whoso conceals hatred with lying lips and at the same time utters slander—*he* is a fool," adding the explanation "one of the most odious of vices is where one conceals hatred under fine speech, and yet slanders behind the back; such a man is in sight of God and men despised and spurned"].

Ver. 19. **Transgression is not wanting.** In this way is the verb to be rendered, with Umbreit, Hitzig and most others: and not with Bertheau, transgression "does not vanish" (as though we had here something to do with a removal or obliteration of actual guilt); only with the former rendering does the antithesis in the 2d member correspond, where it is plain that taciturnity and discretion in speech are recommended; comp. xiii. 3; xvii. 27, 28. [Noyes's translation, "offence," has the fault, rare with him, of obscurity or ambiguity]. With the expression "to govern the lips" compare the Latin *compescere linguam* and the parallels from Arabic and Persian poets which Umbreit adduces in illustration of our passage.

Ver. 20. **Choice silver,** as in chap. viii. 19 (comp. 10) is here used to indicate a very great value.—**Is of no worth,** literally, "is as nothing, is as a trifle,"—a popular and proverbial circumlocution for the idea of utter nothingness or worthlessness.—Ver. 21. **Feed many,** *i. e.* nourish and refresh many with the wholesome doctrines of godliness (comp. Eccles. xii. 11; Ezek. xxxiv. 2 sq; Acts xx. 28).—**But fools die for want of knowledge,** *i. e.* persistent fools (אֱוִילִים) are not only incompetent to become to others teachers of truth and guides to life; they are in themselves children of death for their lack of understanding.

7. Vers. 22–25. Four proverbs relating to the conduct of the righteous and the ungodly and their respective lots. The lot of the righteous, which consists in God's blessing which makes rich without any effort, forms the starting point of the description in ver. 22.—**And labor addeth nothing beside it,** *i. e.* as supplementary and exterior to it, that divine blessing which is all in all, which enriches the friends of God even in sleep (comp. Ps. cxxvii. 2 [and in connection with this Hupfeld's comments: "Naturally this is not to be taken literally, as though perchance labor in itself were cast aside, and the Oriental indolence commended; nor again is the privilege given to the pious of being released from ordinary human toils, and of folding their hands in reliance on their powerful Friend; the aim is only, after the emphatic and one-sided manner of the proverb to make prominent the other side of the case, overlooked by restless toilers, what God does in the matter, so as to warn against the delusion that man can conquer by his toil alone," *etc.*]). This view is correctly taken by Jarchi, Levi ben Gerson, Ewald, Hitzig, *etc.*, while others (LXX, Vulg., Umbreit, Bertheau, Elster, [the E. V., H., N., St., M.]) translate "and addeth no sorrow thereto." But then instead of עִמָּהּ we should rather have had עָלֶיהָ (comp. Jer. xlv. 3).

Ver. 23. **As sport to a fool is the practice of iniquity,** literally, "like a laugh is it to the fool to execute evil counsel." This "like sport" is then to be supplied also before the 2d member; "but to the man of understanding wisdom is as an enjoyment." [M. agrees with our author whose view is both more forcible and more accordant with the Hebrew idiom than that expressed in the E. V. and retained by N. and S.: "a man of understanding has wisdom." More than this is meant: wisdom is his delight.—A.] The verb to practice (עֲשׂוֹת) is probably not to be supplied here before "wisdom" (חָכְמָה); it is self-evident (in opposition to Hitzig's view) that wisdom is considered here as something practiced and not merely possessed. With the phrase "man of understanding," the discerning man, comp. xi. 12.

Ver. 24. **What the wicked feareth,** lit., "the dread of the wicked," comp. Isa. lxvi. 4; Job iii. 25; Prov. xi. 27.—**The desire of the righteous is granted them.**—The verb (יִתֵּן) can be regarded either as impersonal [like the German "*es gibt*," there is: comp. xiii. 10 and Job xxxvii. 10], or directly changed to the passive (יֻתַּן) as the Vulg., the Targums, and among recent interpreters Ewald and Hitzig, *e. g.*, do. To supply as the subject "Jehovah" (Aben Ezra, Umbreit, Elster, Stuart, *etc.*) has its parallels indeed in xiii. 21, 22, but is here less natural than there.

Ver. 25. **When a storm sweepeth by the wicked is no more.** Thus correctly Ewald, Bertheau, Hitzig, [Holden, Stuart, Muenscher]. Against the conception of the first phrase (כַּעֲבוֹר) as a comparison, "as a storm sweepeth by, so," *etc.* (Umbreit, Elster, [E. V., Noyes], *etc.*) we may urge the conjunction וְ before אֵין, as well as the idea of an "everlasting foundation" in the 2d member. With the latter expression comp. ver. 30, and also Ps. cxxv. 1. With the first clause comp. Job i. 19; Isa. xxviii. 18, 19; Prov. i. 27.

8. Ver. 26. An isolated proverb relating to the uselessness and repulsiveness of the sluggish. Comp. xxii. 13, and also vi. 6 sq.; xii. 27; xix. 24.—**As vinegar to the teeth.** So the majority correctly render, while the LXX, Pesch., Arab., *etc.*, falsely translate the noun (חֹמֶץ, comp. Num. vi. 3; Ps. lxix. 22) by "sour grapes" (ὄμφαξ).—**To them that send him.** Perhaps this phrase as referring to the idea which must be supplied, the authority, the master (אֲדוֹנִים), comp. xxv. 13, might be translated by "his sender, his employer." Comp. Hitzig on this passage.

Digitized by Google

9. Vers. 27-30. Four proverbs bearing upon the prosperity of the pious and the ruin of the ungodly. With ver. 27 comp. iii. 1; ix. 11; xiv. 27.—Ver. 28. **The expectation of the righteous is gladness**, *i. e.* as its object comes into possession of him who indulges it. With the 2d clause comp. xi. 7; Job viii. 13; Ps. cxii. 10.

Ver. 29. **Jehovah's way is a bulwark to the innocent.** The meaning doubtless is, Jehovah's way in the administration of the world, His providence, His righteous and gracious rule, proves itself to the pious a strong protection and defence (comp. the "strong city" of ver. 15, also Ps. xxxi. 21; xxxvii. 39; xliii. 2, *etc.*) [Wordsw.: wherever he *goes* he is in a *castle*]. Only with this objective conception of "Jehovah's way" does the antithesis in the 2d clause agree (comp. vers. 14, 15), and not with the subjective, which makes it religion, a devout life. Many, however, (Arnoldi, Ziegler, Umbreit, Elster, [Noyes], *etc.*) unite תֹּם in one conception with דֶּרֶךְ and translate "A fortress is Jehovah to the innocent" (upright in his way); comp. Prov. xiii. 6; Job iv. 6. One must make his choice between the two interpretations, as both are grammatically admissible and yield essentially the same meaning.—Ver. 30. With the first clause comp. xii. 3: with the second, ii. 21; Ps. xxxvii. 29.

10. Vers. 31, 32. Two proverbs standing isolated, treating of the mouth of the righteous and that of the ungodly and their respective utterances or fruits. **The mouth of the righteous putteth forth wisdom**, as the sap of a fruitful tree develops beautiful flowers and fruits; comp. the "fruit of the lips," Isa. lvii. 19 and the corresponding expression καρπὸς χειλέων in Heb. xiii. 15.—In the 2d clause this figure is abandoned, so far as respects the expression "the perverse tongue;" but the "is destroyed" reminds distinctly enough of the hewing down and dying out of unfruitful trees; comp. Matth. iii. 10 vii. 19.—Ver. 32. **Know what is acceptable**, *i. e.*, are familiar with it, know how to say much of it. The noun רָצוֹן is here objective in its meaning, used of that which produces delight (with God and men) the lovely, the charming (comp. Luke iv. 22).—Hitzig on account of the ἀποστάζει of the LXX (they distil, they send forth) reads יַבִּעוּן instead of יֵדְעוּן, from which we do certainly gain a better parallelism of meaning with the 1st clause of the preceding verse. And yet it seems at least suspicious to go so far in this endeavor to secure a parallelism in the contents of the two verses, as actually to transpose, as Hitzig does, the order of their second clauses, and so combine them in the following order: 31, 1st—32, 2d—32, 1st—31, 2d. [Rueetschi, in his criticism upon this tampering with forms and arrangement, says: "It is all needless—nay, it destroys a beautiful, life-like thought, and substitutes for it a dry commonplace." Ver. 31 says: "The mouth of the righteous shooteth forth wisdom, but the perverse tongue is rooted out;" if the mouth of the righteous may be compared to a good tree or field, that must yield good fruit, the deceitful tongue is a bad tree, that can bear only rotten fruit, and for that very reason is cut down, rooted out, destroyed. Ver. 32 adds "The lips of the righteous know," *etc.* "The righteous finds always, as if instinctively, what is acceptable—is, as it were, inspired with it, so that his lips, as it were, naturally find it, while, on the other hand, the wicked knows and understands only what is distorted or perverse, and his mouth therefore speaks only this" (as cited above, p. 138)].

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

The contrast between the righteous and the wicked, or between the wise and foolish, forms evidently the main theme of our chapter. This contrast, after being suggested in a general and prefatory way in ver. 1, is developed with special reference, 1) to the attainment or non-attainment on both parts of earthly possessions, especially riches and a good name (vers. 2-7); 2) to their differing dispositions as expressed by mouth and lips, the organs of speech, with diverse influence on their prosperity in life (vers. 8-14); 3) to the effect, tending on the one side to blessing, on the other to destruction, which the labor of the two classes (whether with the hands or with the lips) has upon themselves and upon others (vers. 15-24 and ver. 26); 4) the different issues of the lives of both (vers. 25, 27-32). With the individual groups of proverbs, as we had occasion to combine them above in the exegetical notes, these main divisions in the treatment of the subject correspond only in part; for the formation of the groups was determined as we saw in manifold ways, and by quite external circumstances and relations.

A peculiarly rich return, in an ethical view, is yielded by those maxims which refer to the earthly revenues and possessions of the pious and the foolish (2-7, 15, 16, 22, 27 sq.). They all serve to illustrate the great truth, "On God's blessing every thing depends," while they no less interpret that other saying (2 Thess. iii. 10; comp. vers. 4, 5 of our chapter). "If any man will not work, neither shall he eat." Eminently important and comparatively original (*i. e.*, never before brought to an emphatic utterance) are also the proverbs relating to the worth of a circumspect reserve in speech (vers. 8, 10, 13, 14, 18, 19, comp. James iii. 3-12); those relating to the ease with which the evil man brings forth his evil and the good his good—plainly because an evil heart underlies the works of the one, a loving spirit the other's whole mode of action (ver. 23; comp. vers. 11, 12, 18, 20, and passages of the New Testament like Matth xii. 33-35; 1 John iii. 7 sq.; v. 3); and lastly those relating to the spiritual blessings for others also that spring forth from the mouth of the pious as the wholesome fruit of his wisdom (vers. 11, 21, 31; comp. Matth. vii. 16 sq.; John xv. 4 sq.; Gal. v. 22; Phil. i. 11; James iii. 18).

HOMILETIC AND PRACTICAL.

Homily on the entire chapter. The pious and the ungodly compared in respect, 1) to their earthly good; 2) to their worth in the eyes of men; 3) to their outward demeanor in intercourse with others; 4) to their disposition of heart as this

Digitized by Google

appears in their mien, their words, their acts; 5) to their diverse fruit, that which they produce in their moral influence on others; 6) to their different fates, as awarded to them at last in the retribution of eternity.—Comp. STÖCKER: True righteousness: 1) its basis (ver. 1); 2) its manifestation and maintenance in life (vers. 2–5); 3) its utility (vers. 6, 7): 4) the manner of its preservation and increase (ver. 8 sq.).*

STARKE:—The great difference between the pious and the ungodly: 1) in respect to temporal blessings (vers. 1–7); 2) in respect to conduct (vers. 8–26); 3) in respect to their prosperity and the issue of their deeds (vers. 27-32).—*Calwer Handbuch:* Of righteousness through wisdom and of unrighteousness through folly and mockery. 1) Warning against the vices which quench delight in righteousness (1-14); 2) admonition to the careful government of the tongue as that on which above all things else the life and the true fruits of righteousness depend (15-21); 3) allusion to riches, long life, the joyful attainment of one's hopes, confidence in God, security, good counsel, *etc.*, as impelling to righteousness, as well as to the opposite of all these as the evil result of sin (22-32).

Vers. 1–7 (Text adapted to a sermon on Education). EGARD: Wilt thou have joy and not sorrow in thy children, then train them in the nurture and admonition of the Lord (Eph. vi. 4).—STÖCKER: Are there to be people that walk justly, *i. e.*, honorably and sincerely before God, then must they be trained to it from childhood. The education of children is the foundation that must be laid for righteousness.—Ver. 3 sq. STARKE: Although all depends chiefly on God's blessing, yet not for that reason is man discharged from labor. Labor is the ordinance in which God will reveal His blessing (Ps. cxxviii. 2).—VON GERLACH: The Lord maketh rich, but by the industry which the righteous by His grace exercise.—[Bp. BUTLER: Riches were first bestowed upon the world as they are still continued in it, by the blessing of God upon the industry of men, in the use of their understanding and strength.]—Vers. 6, 7. OSIANDER (in STARKE): A good name among men is also reasonably to be reckoned among the excellent gifts of God, Ps. cxii. 6; Eccles vii. 1.—GEIER: To the righteous not only does God grant good in this life and the future; all good men also wish them all good and intercede for it day by day, without their knowing or suspecting it, that it may descend on them from God. Many righteous men unknown, or even hated during their life, are first truly known after their death and distinguished by honors of every kind, as the Apostles, Prophets, Martyrs, *etc.* The offensiveness of the ungodly, on the contrary, where even so much as the mention of their name is involved, is perpetual.—Funeral discourse on ver. 7. ZIEGLER (in ZIMMERMANN'S *Sonntagsfeier*, 1858, pp. 760 sq.): The memory of the just is blessed 1) because of his winning friendship; 2) because of his unfeigned piety; 3) because of his steadfast patience; 4) because of his noble, public-spirited activity.—[Ver. 7. J. FOSTER: The just show in the most evident and pleasing manner the gracious connexion which God has constantly maintained with a sinful world; they are verifying examples of the excellence of genuine religion; they diminish to our view the repulsiveness and horror of death; their memory is combined with the whole progress of the cause of God on earth,—with its living agency through every stage.—TRAPP: Be good and do good, so shall thy name be heir to thy life.]

Vers. 8–14. GEIER (on ver. 8): Long as one lives he has to learn and to grow in knowledge, but above all also in the art of governing the tongue. A fool is in nothing sooner and better recognized than in his conversation —[Ver. 9. BARROW: Upright simplicity is the deepest wisdom, and perverse craft the merest shallowness; he who is most true and just to others is most faithful and friendly to himself, and whoever doth abuse his neighbor is his own greatest cheat and foe.—BRIDGES: "Show me an easier path" is nature's cry. "Show me," cries the child of God, "a *sure* path." Such is the upright walk, under the shield of the Lord's protection and providence; under the shadow of His promises, in the assurance of His present favor, and in its peaceful end.]—J. LANGE (on ver. 10): In his very bearing and gestures the Christian must so carry himself that there can be read in them true love, due reverence and sincerity.—He who has too many compliments for every body is seldom sincere; trust not such a one, *etc.*—[Ver. 11. ARNOT: The Lord looks down and men look up expecting to see a fringe of living green around the lip of a Christian's life course.]—ZELTNER (on ver. 12): Love is the noblest spice in all things, the first fruit of faith, the most useful thing in all conditions, yea, a truly Divine virtue, for God Himself is love.—Take love out of the world, and thou wilt find nothing but contention. Of the utility of true love one can never preach enough. [T. ADAMS: "Love covereth all sins," saith Solomon; covers them partly from the eyes of God, in praying for the offenders; partly from the eyes of the world in throwing a cloak over our brother's nakedness; especially from its own eyes, by winking at many wrongs offered it.]—CRAMER (on vers. 13, 14): It is no shame to know nothing, but it is indeed to wish to know nothing. Learn in thy youth, and thou hast benefit therefrom thy life long.—HASIUS (on ver. 13): He who makes his tongue a rod to scourge others with, must often in turn give his back to correction.—VON GERLACH: The fool must like the beast be corrected with the stick, since he is capable of no rational teaching.—[BRADFORD: He that trembleth not in hearing shall be broken to pieces in feeling.]

Vers. 15-26. GEIER (on vers. 15, 16): Riches are a means that may be employed for good, but

* STÖCKER brings the contents of chaps. x.—xxiv. in general under five titles, corresponding to the five chief virtues: Justice, Modesty, Wisdom, Temperance, Patience. To Justice he assigns the contents of chapters x and xi.; to Moderation chaps. xii. and xiii.; to Wisdom chaps. xiv.—xvi.; to Temperance chaps. xvii.—xxiii.; to Patience chap. xxiv. He himself admits the arbitrariness of this division, and yet thinks there is no undue violence done thereby to the proverbs in question; for there is "in these proverbs of Solomon (in chaps. x.—xxiv.) in general a certain quality such as we may have seen in a beautiful green meadow, on which all manner of beautiful, lovely, glorious flowers of many sorts and colors are to be fallen in with or found, which stand wonderfully mixed and confused, and are only afterwards to be brought and placed in a certain order by some maiden who gathers them for a wreath." (*Sermons, etc.*, p. 166.)

Digitized by Google

as, alas, generally happens, may be misused in the service of vanity and evil. Poverty is in itself a sad thing (Prov. xxx. 8), and brings besides serious dangers to the soul; for an humble heart, however, that, child-like, submits to God's correction and guidance, it may also become a security against many kinds of sins.—[Vers. 15, 16. TRAPP: Surely this should humble us, that riches—that should be our rises to raise us up to God, or glasses to see the love of God in—our corrupt nature uses them as clouds, as clogs, *etc.*, yea, sets them up in God's place.—Lord BACON: This is excellently expressed, that riches are as a stronghold in imagination, and not always in fact; for certainly great riches have sold more men than they have bought out.—BRIDGES: Our labor is God's work—wrought in dependence on Him—not for life, but to life.—Ver. 18. BARROW: Since our faculty of speech was given us as in the first place to praise and glorify our Maker, so in the next to benefit and help our neighbor, it is an unnatural, perverting and irrational abuse thereof to employ it to the damage, disgrace, vexation or wrong in any kind of our brother.—ARNOT: Strangle the evil thoughts as they are coming to the birth, that the spirits which troubled you within may not go forth embodied to trouble also the world.—They who abide in Christ will experience a sweet necessity of doing good to men; they who really try to do good to men will be compelled to abide in Christ.]—STARKE (on ver. 18). Open hatred and secret slander are both alike works of Satan against which a true Christian should be on his guard —(On vers. 19-21): The more one gives free course to his tongue, the more does he defile his conscience, comes too near God and his neighbor. But how usefully can a consecrated tongue be employed in the instruction, consolation and counsel of one's neighbor! Therefore let the Holy Spirit of God rule thy heart and thy tongue, Eph. iii. 29. (On ver. 23): It is devilish to sin and then boast of sin. The wanton laughter of the wicked is followed at last, and often soon enough, by weeping and wailing, Luke vii. 25.—(On ver. 24): With all the good cheer of sinners there is yet sometimes found in them a strange unrest. Their own conscience chastises them and causes dismay.—(On ver. 26): Indolence is injurious to every one, whether in a spiritual or a secular calling. Not by ease, but by diligence and fidelity does one honorably fulfil his office; 1 Cor. iv. 2.—[BUNYAN: All the hopes of the wicked shall not bring him to heaven; all the fears of the righteous shall not bring him to hell.—ARNOT:—Fear and hope were common to the righteous and the wicked in time: at the border of eternity the one will be relieved from all his fear, the other will be deprived of all his hope. —(On ver. 26): The minor morals are not neglected in the Scriptures. He who is a Christian in little things is not a little Christian. He is the greatest Christian and the most useful. The baptism of these little outlying things shows that he is full of grace, for these are grace's overflowings.]—*Berleb. Bible* (on vers. 19-21): As silence is in many ways needful, as Christ Himself hath taught us by His own example so on the other hand we should offend God and rob Him of His honor if we would keep silence when He will have us speak. The lips of the righteous often serve God as an instrument by which He speaketh and instructeth him that needeth.

Vers. 27-32. ZELTNER: There is no grosser self-deception than when one in persistent impenitence and impiety yet imagines that he is at last to live in heaven.—GEIER: If thy hope of eternal blessedness is not to fail thee, it must be based on the righteousness of Christ appropriated by faith, for this alone avails with God —(On vers. 30): Let us love and long for that which is really eternal and unchangeable; for only then can we say "I shall not be moved," Ps. x. 6; xxx. 6.—STARKE (on vers. 31, 32): When God's honor and the edification and improvement of one's neighbor is not the chief end of our speaking; it is a sign that eternal wisdom has not yet wholly sanctified our hearts, comp. ver. 13, 14.—WOHLFARTH (on vers. 23-32): The sinner's fear and the hope of the righteous (comp. 1 John iv. 18; iii. 8).

---

b) Comparison between the good results of piety and the disadvantages and penalties of ungodliness.

CHAPS. XI.—XV.

a) With reference to just and unjust, benevolent and malevolent *conduct towards one's neighbor*.

CHAP. XI.

1 A false balance is an abomination to Jehovah,
but a true weight is his delight.
2 Pride cometh, then cometh shame,
but with the humble is wisdom.
3 The integrity of the upright guideth them,
but the perverseness of the ungodly shall destroy them.

Digitized by Google

4 Riches profit not in the day of wrath,
but righteousness delivereth from death.
5 The righteousness of the upright maketh smooth his way,
but by his wickedness doth the wicked fall.
6 The integrity of the upright delivereth them,
but by their transgressions shall the wicked be taken.
7 With the death of the wicked (his) hope cometh to nought,
and the unjust expectation hath perished.
8 The righteous is delivered from trouble,
and the wicked cometh in his stead.
9 The hypocrite with his mouth destroyeth his neighbor,
but by the knowledge of the righteous shall they (he) be delivered.
10 In the prosperity of the upright the city rejoiceth,
but at the destruction of the wicked (there is) shouting.
11 By the blessing of the upright is the city exalted,
but by the mouth of the wicked it is destroyed.
12 He that speaketh contemptuously of his neighbor lacketh wisdom,
but a man of understanding is silent.
13 He who goeth about as a slanderer revealeth secrets,
he who is of a faithful spirit concealeth the matter.
14 Where there is no direction the people fall,
but in a multitude of counsellors is safety.
15 He shall fare ill that is security for a stranger,
but whoso hateth suretyship liveth in quiet.
16 A pleasing woman retaineth honor,
and strong men retain riches.
17 A benevolent man doeth good to himself,
and the cruel troubleth his own flesh.
18 The wicked gaineth a deceptive result,
but he that soweth righteousness a sure reward.
19 He that holdeth fast integrity (cometh) to life,
but he that pursueth evil to his death.
20 An abomination to Jehovah are the perverse in heart,
but they that walk uprightly His delight.
21 Assuredly (hand to hand) the wicked goeth not unpunished,
but the seed of the righteous is delivered.
22 A jewel of gold in a swine's snout,
(and) a fair woman that hath lost discretion.
23 The desire of the righteous is good only,
the expectation of the wicked is (God's) wrath.
24 There is that scattereth and it increaseth still,
and (there is) that stinteth only to poverty.
25 A liberal soul shall be well fed,
and he that watereth others is also watered.
26 Whoso withholdeth corn the people curse him,
but blessings (come) upon the head of him that selleth it.
27 He that striveth after good seeketh favor,
but he that searcheth for evil, it shall find him.
28 He that trusteth in his riches shall fall,
but as a green leaf shall the righteous flourish.
29 He that troubleth his own house shall inherit wind,
and the fool shall be servant to the wise in heart.
30 The fruit of the righteous is a tree of life,
and the wise man winneth souls.
31 Lo, the righteous shall be recompensed on earth,
much more the ungodly and the sinner.

Digitized by Google

GRAMMATICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 2.—בָּא is given by Böttcher, § 950, 1, as an example of the *Perfectum relativum*, the precise time being a matter of indifference. The Imperf. that follows is then a contingent tense describing a normal consequence, § 980 B.]

Ver. 3.—ושדם, to be read יְשָׁדֵּם with the K'ri. [Böttcher, in explaining forms like this, of which he adduces a considerable number, § 929, β, refers to but rejects the old explanation which makes the ו an older form of the 3d personal prefix (from the pronoun הוּא), and regards it as representing in the view of the K'thibh the conjunction וּ, an error which is here corrected in the K'ri.]

Ver. 15.—רַע in רַע יֵרוֹעַ is probably not Infin. abs. Kal. (which should be רוֹעַ), but a substantive, here used adverbially and attached to the reflexive Future Niphal יֵרוֹעַ to strengthen the idea. [Fuerst, while giving רַע as an intransitive Infin. abs., also suggests that it *may be* a noun, giving it however the place and power of a masc. and not a neuter, and making it the subject, "*der Schlechthandelnde*,"—he that manages ill.]

Ver. 25.—יוֹרֶא is either to be taken as the Imperf. Hophal of ירה=ירא, or by change of pointing to be read יִירָא and this is then to be regarded as another form of יִרְוֶה (Hitzig; comp. Ziegler and Elster).

EXEGETICAL.

1. Vers. 1-11. Eleven proverbs on the value of a just demeanor towards one's neighbor, and on the curse of unrighteousness.—With vers. 1 comp. xx. 10, 23, and also Meidani's collection of Arabic proverbs, III., 538, where the first member at least appears, and that too expressly as a proverb of Solomon.—**A true weight**, lit., "a full stone;" comp. Deut. xxv. 13, where אֶבֶן in like manner signifies the weight of a balance.—Ver. 2. **Pride cometh, then cometh shame**;—lit., "there hath come pride, and there will come shame," *i. e.*, on the proud; comp. xvi. 18; xviii. 12.—**But with the humble is wisdom.**—That wisdom, namely, which confers honor (iii. 16; viii. 18). "The humble," derived from צנה, which in Chaldee signifies "to conceal," denote strictly those who hide themselves, or renounce self (ταπεινοί, ταπεινόφρονες).—Ver. 3. **The** (faithlessness of the false) **perverseness of the ungodly destroyeth them.**—"**Destroyeth**,"—from the root שד which means "violently to fall upon and kill," and not merely to "desolate" (comp. Jer. v. 6). סֶלֶף should in accordance with the Arabic be explained either by "falseness, perverseness" (as ordinarily), or with Hitzig "trespass, transgression."—Ver. 4. **In the day of wrath**, *viz.*, the Divine wrath and judgment; comp. Zeph. i. 18; Ezek. vii. 19; Job xxi. 30. With reference to the general thought comp. chap. x. 2.—Vers. 5 and 6 are exactly parallel not only each to the other, but also to ver. 3. Comp. also iii. 6; x. 3.—**And by their lusts are the wicked taken.**—Literally, "and by the lusts ('cravings' as in x. 13) of the wicked (false) are they (the wicked) taken;" the construction is the same therefore as in Gen. ix. 6; Ps. xxxii. 6; comp. also ver. 3.—Ver. 7.—A further development of the idea in the second clause of x. 28.—**The unjust expectation.**—Lit., "the expectation of depravities, of wickedness" (אוֹנִים plur. of אָוֶן). Most interpreters regard the noun here as an abstract for a concrete: "the expectation of the ungodly, the wicked" [so De W., E. V., H., N., M., W.]. Ewald interprets it in accordance with Hos. ix. 4 by "sorrows" (continuance of sorrow); others in accordance with Is. xl. 26, render it by "might." In support of our interpretation see Hitzig on this passage. [Fuerst suggests that the form may be participial from the verb אוּן with the signification "the troubled, the sorrowing," and Böttcher, § 811, 3, deriving it as a participial form from אָנָה, reaches the same meaning; this is also Stuart's view, while Kamph. agrees with our author—A.] The antithesis in idea between the first and second clauses which is lacking in this verse, the LXX attempts to supply by reading in the first clause "when the righteous man dieth, hope doth not perish" (*τελευτήσαντος ἀνδρὸς δικαίου οὐκ ὄλλυται ἐλπίς*); they thus put the hope of the righteous reaching beyond death in contrast with the hopeless end of the life of the ungodly. This thought the original text certainly does not express; but immortality and a future retribution are yet presumptively suggested in the passage, as Muntinghe, Umbreit, Lutz (*Bibl. Dogmatik*, p. 100, *etc.*) and others have correctly assumed. Comp. the "Doctrinal" notes.

Ver. 8. **The righteous is delivered from trouble**, *etc.*—This proposition presented so conclusively "cannot be the result of experimental observation, but only the fresh, vigorous expression of *faith* in God's justice, such as believes where it does not see" (Elster).—Ver. 9. **The flatterer** (hypocrite) **with his mouth destroyeth his neighbor.**—For the verbal explanation of חָנֵף which, according to the old Rabbinical tradition, and according to the Vulgate, denotes a hypocrite (Vulg., *simulator*), comp. Hitzig on this passage. He moreover needlessly alters this first clause in harmony with the LXX (in the mouth of the hypocrite is a snare for his neighbor), and gives to the second member also a totally different form; "and in the misfortune of the righteous do they rejoice."—**By the knowledge of the righteous are they delivered**;—they, *i. e.*, his neighbors; the sing. "his neighbor," which is altogether general, admits of being thus continued by a verb in the plural. The meaning of the verse as a whole is "By the protective power of that knowledge which serves righteousness, they are delivered who were endangered by the artifices of that shrewdness which is the instrument of wickedness" (Elster].

Ver. 10. **In the prosperity of the upright.**—בְּטוּב, an infinitive construction; literally, "when it goes well to the righteous," as in the second clause בַּאֲבֹד, "in the perishing," when they perish. Comp. xxix. 2.—Hitzig

Digitized by Google

strikes out this verse mainly to secure again within vers. 4-11 a group of seven proverbs, as before in x. 29—xi. 3, but without being able to allege any ground whatever of suspicion that is really valid.—Ver. 11 gives the reason why the population of a city rejoices at the prosperity of the righteous and exults at the downfall of the wicked.—**By the blessing of the righteous is the city exalted,**—*i. e.*, by the beneficent and salutary words and acts (not by the benevolent wishes only) of the righteous (literally, "the straight, true, straightforward") is the city raised to a flourishing condition and growth, *exaltabitur civitas* (Vulg.). Not so well ELSTER: "is the city made secure"—as if the idea here related to the throwing up walls of defence.

2. Vers. 12-15. Four proverbs against talkativeness, a slanderous disposition, foolish counsel and thoughtless suretyship.—**He that speaketh contemptuously of his neighbor.**—This is the rendering here required to correspond with the antithesis in the second clause; comp. xiv. 21; xiii. 13. [The E. V. and HOLDEN invert this relation of subject and predicate, while DE W., K., N., S., and M. agree with our author in following the order of the original—A.]—Ver. 13. **He that goeth about as a slanderer betrayeth secrets.**—With this expression, "to go tattling, to go for slander," comp. Lev. xix. 16; Jer. ix. 3. With the expression גֹּלֶה סוֹד, *revelavit arcanum*, "to reveal a secret," comp. xx. 19: xxv. 9; Am. iii. 7. That not this "babbler of secrets" is subject of the clause (HITZIG), but "he that goeth slandering," the parallel second clause makes evident, where with the "slanderer" is contrasted the faithful and reliable, and with the babbler the man who "concealeth the matter, *i. e.*, the secret committed to him." Comp. Ecclesiasticus xxvii. 16.

Ver. 14. **Where there is no direction.**—For this term comp. i. 5.—**In the multitude of counsellors there is safety.**—This thought recurring again in xv. 22; xxiv. 6, is naturally founded on the assumption that the counsellors are good and intelligent persons, and by no means conflicts with the conditional truth of the modern proverb, "Too many cooks spoil the broth;" or this, "He who asks long errs long," *etc.*

Ver. 15. **He shall fare ill that is surety for a stranger.**—"Ill, ill does it go with him,—ill, very ill will he fare,—ill at ease will he be," *etc* Instead of "who is surety," *etc.*, the original has literally "if one is surety," *etc.*—With the second clause comp. remarks above on chap. vi. 1 sq. Instead of תּוֹקְעִים (partic.) we ought probably to read here תְּקָעִים (subst.) (HITZIG), or to take the plural participle in the sense of the abstract "striking hands" (instead of "those striking hands)." Thus, *e. g.*, UMBREIT. Not so well the majority of commentators (EWALD, BERTHEAU, ELSTER, among others), who read "he that hateth sureties," *i. e.*, who will not belong to their number, who avoids fellowship with such as lightly strike hands as sureties, who therefore does not follow their example.

3. Vers. 16-23. Eight proverbs of miscellaneous import, mostly treating of the blessing that attends righteousness and the deserved judgment of impiety.—**A gracious woman retaineth honor and strong men retain riches.**—So reads the Hebrew text, according to which there is a comparison made here; as mighty men (lit., "tyrants, terrible men," comp. βιασταί, Matth. xi. 12) retain their wealth and will not allow it to be torn from them, with the same energy and decision does a "gracious woman" (comp. v. 19) watch over her honor as an inalienable possession. Comp. the similar sentiment, chap. xxix. 23 (where we have the same, "holdeth fast honor"); and as to the force of comparative sentences formed thus simply with the copulative conjunction וְ, comp. xxv. 25; xxvi. 9; Job v. 7; xii. 11; xiv. 18, 19, *etc.*—The LXX, whom ZIEGLER, EWALD, HITZIG follow, read חָרוּצִים (*i. e.*, diligent men, comp. x. 4), and besides insert two clauses between the first and second of this verse, so that the whole proverb has this expanded form:

"A gracious woman obtaineth honor;
but a throne of disgrace is she that hateth virtue.
The idle will be destitute of means,
but the diligent will obtain wealth."

For the authenticity of this fuller form may be urged especially the vigorous expression "throne of disgrace" (θρόνος ἀτιμίας), which is hardly the product of later invention, but rather agrees antithetically with the expression which is several times found, "a seat or throne of honor" (כִּסֵּא כָבוֹד), 1 Sam. ii. 8; Is. xxii. 23; Jer. xvii. 12. [While RUEETSCHI (as cited above, p. 138) seems to admit the antiquity of the form reproduced in the version of the LXX, he thus defends and amplifies the sense of the shorter form found in the Masoretic text, "A woman is powerful by her grace as the mighty are by their strength. In grace there lies as great force as in the imposing nature of the mighty; nay, the power of the strength of the latter gains only more property, while the woman gains honor and esteem, which are of more worth."]

Ver. 17. **The benevolent man doeth good to himself.**—Lit., "the man of love," who by the goodness which he manifests towards others, benefits his own soul. The second clause in its contrast with this: "And his own flesh doth the cruel trouble," does not aim to characterize any thing like the unnatural self-torture of gloomy ascetics, but to express the simple thought that on account of the penalty with which God requites cruel and hard-hearted conduct, such conduct is properly a raging against one's self. Thus the LXX had correctly expressed the idea, and among modern interpreters HITZIG, ELSTER, *etc.*, while the great body (UMBREIT, EWALD, BERTHEAU among them), comparing Ecclesiast. xiv. 5, find the meaning of the verse to be directed against niggardliness, or ascetic self-torture: He who deals harshly and unkindly with himself will treat others also no better."

Ver. 18. **The wicked gaineth delusive gains,**—*i. e.* such as result in no good to himself, such as escape from under his hands. Comp. x. 2, and with reference to פְּעֻלָּה, gain, acquisition, x. 16.—**But he that soweth righteousness,**

Digitized by Google

a sure reward.—The "sure reward" (שֶׂכֶר אֱמֶת, perhaps in its sound in intentional accord with שֶׁקֶר in the first member) is also governed by the verb "gaineth" or "worketh out" (עֹשֶׂה); comp. Jer. xvii. 11, *etc.* For this figure of "sowing righteousness," *i. e.* the several right acts, which like a spiritual seed-corn are to yield as their harvest the rewards of God's grace, comp. James iii. 18; 1 Cor. ix. 11; 2 Cor. ix. 6; also Job iv. 8; Gal. vi. 8, *etc.*—**Whoso holdeth fast integrity** (cometh) **to life.**—כֵּן before צדקה (righteousness) if genuine, (the LXX and Syriac versions read instead בֵּן, "son"), can be only an adjective or participle derived from the verb כּוּן "to be firm," having the meaning "firm" (comp. Gen. xlii. 11, 19); it therefore denotes "the steadfast in righteousness," *i. e.* as the antithetic phrase in the 2d member shows, "he who holds fast to righteousness, who firmly abides in it." Thus ZIEGLER, EWALD, UMBREIT, ELSTER, *etc.* Others, like COCCEIUS, SCHULTENS, MICHAELIS, DÖDERLEIN, take the word as a substantive—steadfastness (?); still others regard it as a particle in the ordinary meaning "thus" (by which construction however the verse would lose its independent character, and become a mere appendage to the preceding proverb); and finally, HITZIG conjecturally substitutes כְּנֵס and translates "As a standard is righteousness to life."

Vers. 20, 21. Two new maxims concerning the contrasted lot of the righteous and the wicked, serving to confirm vers. 18 and 19. With ver. 20 comp. ii. 21; xvii. 20.—**Assuredly**, literally, "hand to hand," a formula of strong asseveration, derived from the custom of becoming surety by clasping hands (ver. 15), and therefore substantially equivalent to "I pledge it, I guarantee it." Comp. the German formula which challenges to an honest self-scrutiny, "*die Hand auf's Herz!*" (the hand on the heart!); and for the sentiment of the 1st clause compare xvi. 5. [FUERST and K. regard the formula as one of asseveration; GESEN., DE W. and NOYES interpret, by the analogy of some similar expressions in cognate languages, as referring to time, "through all generations;" H., M., S. and W. retain the rendering of the E. V., "though hand join in hand." The exceeding brevity of the Hebrew formula stimulates inquiry and conjecture without clearly establishing either interpretation.—A.]—**But the seed of the righteous escapeth**, literally, "delivers itself" (נִמְלָט a Niphal participle with reflexive meaning), that is, in the day of the divine wrath, comp. vers. 4, 23. The "seed of the righteous" is not the posterity of the righteous (*soboles justorum*, SCHALLER, ROSENMUELLER, BERTHEAU) but is equivalent to the multitude, the generation of the righteous. Comp. Isa. lxv. 23, "the seed of the blessed of Jehovah."

Ver. 22. **A gold ring in a swine's snout; a fair woman that hath lost discretion.**—This last phrase (סָרַת טָעַם) literally denotes "one who has turned aside in respect to taste," *i. e.* one who lacks all moral sensibility, all higher appreciation of beauty and sense of propriety, in a word, a chaste and pure heart,—an unchaste woman. Only with this conception does the figure of the swine agree, and not with that given by ROSENMUELLER, BERTHEAU, EWALD, ELSTER, "without judgment," *i. e.* stupid, weak. Compare furthermore the Arabic proverb here cited by HITZIG (from SCHEID's *Selecta quædam ex sententiis, etc.*, 47): "*Mulier sine verecundia est ut cibus sine sale*, [a woman without modesty is like food without salt]. For the "gold ring" (ring for the nose, נֶזֶם, not circlet for the hair, LUTHER) comp. Gen. xxiv. 47; Isa. iii. 21, and also in general what is cited by UMBREIT, in connection with this passage, on the habits of the Eastern women in respect to this kind of ornament.

Ver. 23. **The desire of the righteous is good only,**—*i. e.* nothing but prosperity and blessing, because God rewards and prospers them in everything. Comp. x. 28, and with the 2d clause where "wrath" denotes again God's wrath, comp. ver. 4 above.

4. Vers. 24–26. Three proverbs against avarice, hard-heartedness and usury.—**Many a one scattereth and it increaseth still.**—Comp. Ps. cxii. 9 (2 Cor. ix. 9), where the same verb is used of the generous distribution of benefactions, of scattering (σκορπίζειν) in the good sense (different from that of Luke xv. 13). For it is to this only true form of prodigality, this "sowing of righteousness" that the expression applies, as the two following verses plainly show.—**And many save only to poverty**, literally, "and a withholder of wealth only to want;" (thus BERTHEAU correctly renders, following SCHULTENS, *etc.*). With the participial clause (וְחוֹשֵׂךְ מִיֹּשֶׁר) the affirmative of the preceding clause (יֵשׁ, there is, there appears) still continues in force. HITZIG's attempted emendation is needless, according to which we ought to read וְחֹשְׂכִים יֵשׁ in correspondence with the language of the LXX, εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ οἱ συνάγοντες. Others, like SCHELLING, UMBREIT, EWALD, ELSTER (comp. also LUTHER), translate "who withholdeth more than is right;" but thus to give a comparative force to מִן after חָשַׂךְ has no sufficient grammatical support, and instead of מִיֹּשֶׁר we should, according to xvii. 26, rather expect עַל יֹשֶׁר. The signification "wealth," *opulentia* for יֹשֶׁר is abundantly confirmed by the corresponding Arabic word.

Ver. 25. **A liberal soul is well fed**, lit., "a soul of blessing is made fat," comp. xiii. 4; xxviii. 25; Ps. xxii. 29; Isa. x. 16; xvii. 4, *etc.*—**And he that watereth others is likewise watered**, lit., "he that sprinkleth others is also sprinkled" (comp. Vulgate, "*inebriat . . . . inebriabitur*"). The meaning of the expression is unquestionably this, that God will recompense with a corresponding refreshing the man who refreshes and restores others. Comp. Jer. xxxi. 14, and with reference to the general sentiment Eccles. xi. 1; Ecclesiast. xi. 11, *etc.*

Ver. 26. **Whoso withholdeth corn, him the people curse.**—The withholding of grain is a peculiarly injurious form of the "withholding of property" mentioned in ver. 24. לְאוֹם, people,

Digitized by Google

multitude, as in xxiv. 24. With the 2d clause comp. x. 6.

5. Vers. 27–31. Five additional proverbs relating to the contrast between the righteous and the wicked and their several conditions.—**Seeketh favor**, that is, God's favor, *gratiam Dei;* comp. Ps. v. 12; Isa. xlix. 8. With the sentiment of ver. 27 compare in general x. 24; Am. v. 14 sq.

Ver. 28. **He that trusteth in his riches shall fall.**—Comp. x. 2: Ps. xlix. 6; Ecclesiast. v. 8.—**But as a green leaf shall the righteous flourish.** Comp. Ps. xcii. 12; Isa. lxvi. 14. "As a leaf," *i. e.* like a fresh, green leaf on a tree, in contrast with the withered, falling leaf, to which the fool should rather be compared who trusts in his riches. JAEGER and HITZIG (following the LXX) read וּמַעֲלֶה "and he who raiseth up," that is, raiseth up the righteous man, proves himself their helper in time of need. On account of the appropriate antithesis to the 1st clause this reading is perhaps preferable.

Ver. 29. **He that troubleth his own house**, lit., "saddeneth" (as in ver. 17), *i. e.* the avaricious man, who is striving after unjust gains, straitens his own household, deprives them of their merited earnings, oppresses and distresses them, *etc.;* comp. chap. xv. 27; 1 Kings xviii. 17 (where Elijah is described by Ahab as the man that "troubleth" Israel, *i. e.* allows them to suffer, brings them into calamity).—**Shall inherit wind**, *i. e.* with all his avaricious, hard-hearted acting and striving will still gain nothing. Comp. Isa. xxvi. 18; Hos. viii. 7.—**The fool becometh servant to the wise in heart**, that is, this same foolish niggard and miser by his very course is so far reduced that he must as a slave serve some man of understanding (a master not avaricious but truly just and compassionate). Comp. ver. 24.

Ver. 30. **The fruit of the righteous**, *i. e.* that which the righteous man says and does, the result of his moral integrity, and not in an altogether specific sense, his reward, as HITZIG maintains (in accordance with Jer. xxxii. 19).—**Is a tree of life** (comp. note on iii. 18), a growth from which there springs forth life for many, a fountain of blessing and of life for many. UMBREIT, ELSTER and others unnecessarily repeat "fruit" (פְּרִי) before the "tree of life" (עֵץ חַיִּים); "is a fruit of the tree of life."—**And the wise man winneth souls**, by the irresistible power of his spirit he gains many souls for the service of God and for the cause of truth. [The E. V. which has the support of H., S., and M., here again inverts the order of subject and predicate, conforming to the order of the original. The parallelism seems to favor our author's rendering which is also that of DE W. and N. Both conceptions are full of meaning and practical value.—A.] HITZIG here again alters in accordance with the LXX, substituting חָמָס for חָכָם; "but violence taketh life" (? !). ZIEGLER, DÖDERLEIN, DATHE, EWALD transpose the clauses of vers. 29 and 30 into this order: 29, 1st; 30, 1st; 29, 2d; 30, 2d. For arguments against this violent transposition of clauses see UMBREIT, BERTHEAU and HITZIG on this passage.

Ver. 31. **Behold the righteous shall be recompensed on earth.** That the "shall be recompensed" denotes specifically requital *by punishment*, and therefore the retribution of the sins of the righteous, cannot be positively maintained on account of the comprehensiveness of the idea of recompense (שִׁלֵּם). Yet a comparison with the 2d clause unquestionably makes this specific meaning very natural; the whole then appears as an *argumentatio a majori ad minus*, and LUTHER's rendering, "Thus the righteous must suffer on earth," substantially hits the true meaning. On the other hand the Alexandrian version introduces a foreign idea when it renders, "If the righteous be scarcely saved" (Εἰ ὁ μὲν δίκαιος μόλις σώζεται,—see also the New Testament's citation, 1 Pet. iv. 18); for the verb שלם never signifies "to be delivered."

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

That it is chiefly that righteousness which is to be manifested in intercourse with one's neighbor that is commended in the proverbs of our chapter, and against the opposite of which they all warn, needs no detailed proof. For the first eleven verses relate solely to this antithesis, and in the second and larger section of the chapter also there are added to the proverbs which refer to the duties of justice for the most part only commendations of merciful, and censures of cruel, hard-hearted conduct (vers. 17, 18, 24–26, 29, 30). Those proverbs which have reference to the lack of intelligent counsellors (14), to inconsiderate suretyship (15), and to feminine grace and purity (16, 22), take their place among the precepts which enjoin righteousness in the widest sense (in so far as wisdom in rulers is an absolutely indispensable condition of prosperity in civil, and a wise economy and womanly honor in domestic society). The separation of these interspersed proverbs, it is true, renders it impossible to demonstrate within the section before us (vers. 12–31), any grouping as undertaken according to a definite principle of classification.

To that which is comparatively new in the dogmatical or ethical line, as presented in our chapter, there belongs above all else the suggestion of a *hope of immortality* in ver. 7. With the death of the ungodly all is over for him; from the future life he has nothing more to hope; he has had his good here below in advance; his reward has been paid him long beforehand; there awaits him henceforth nothing more than a cheerless, hopeless condition of unending pain, "a fearful awaiting of judgment and fiery indignation that shall consume the rebellious" (Heb. x. 27; comp. Luke xvi. 25; Matt. vi. 2, 16; vii. 23; xv. 12, *etc.*). This is the series of thoughts which is inevitably suggested by the proposition "with the death of the wicked hope perishes;" the bright reverse of this here quite as distinctly, as in the similar representations of the Psalms, especially in the 49th Psalm, which is so preeminently important for the doctrine of the Old Testament concerning immortality and future retribution, depicts the certainty that the right-

Digitized by Google

eous will attain to an eternally blessed life,—a certainty whose foundation is in God (comp. Ps. xlix. 14, 15, and in connection with this HOFMANN, *Schriftbew.*, II. 2, p. 467). ELSTER denies that the sentiment of the verse points indirectly to a life after death, because "according to the doctrine of Proverbs the hope of the righteous is already fulfilled in the earthly life" (comp. also BRUCH, *Weisheitslehre, etc.*, p. 117). But the doctrine of retribution set forth in our book is (see below, remarks on xiv. 32) as far from being an exclusively earthly one, limited to the present life, as that of the Psalms or the Book of Job (comp. DELITZSCH on Job xix. 26 sq.; and also KÖNIG, *Die Unsterblichkeitslehre des Buches Hiob*, 1855). And as respects our chapter in particular, the two-fold allusion to the divine wrath (vers. 4, 23), and the assurance which is expressed altogether without qualification, that "the wicked will not go unpunished" (ver. 21; comp. notes above on this passage), point with sufficient clearness to this conclusion, that to the religious consciousness of the author of our Proverbs a retribution beyond the grave was an established fact. The closing verse of the chapter, "Behold, the righteous is recompensed on earth; how much more the ungodly and the sinner!" is by no means opposed to this view. For the main stress here falls not upon the "on earth," but upon "the righteous" (comp. the exegetical explanation of the passage); and it is not the certainty of a visitation of sin occurring *within the earthly life*, but the certainty of such a visitation in general upon the wrong committed on the earth (by the righteous as well as the wicked), that forms the proper substance and object of the expression.

Besides these, characteristic utterances of our chapter that are of special dogmatical and ethical significance are, the announcements concerning the blessing which goes forth from wise and upright citizens upon their fellow-citizens (vers. 10, 11, 14, comp. especially the exegetical comments on the last passage); concerning the serious injury which the hard-hearted and cruel does above all to himself, especially when he leaves his own house and his nearest connections to suffer from his avarice (vers. 17, 29, comp. 1 Tim. v. 8); concerning the blessing of beneficence, and the injurious and perverse nature of avarice in general and of avaricious usury in particular (vers. 24–26); and finally concerning the life-giving and soul-refreshing power which the conduct of a just and truly wise man has, like a magnet endowed with peculiar attractive power and working at a distance (ver. 30, comp. Matt. xii. 30, the "gathering with the Lord").

HOMILETIC AND PRACTICAL.

Homily on the entire chapter. Not justice only, which gives and leaves to every one his own, but love, which from spontaneous impulse resigns its own to others, and even for God's sake and in reliance on Him scatters it without concern,—this is the conduct of the truly wise. For "love worketh no ill to his neighbor; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law" (Rom. xiii. 10).—Comp. STÖCKER: Justice, as Solomon here commends it, relates 1) to private life (vers. 1-9); 2) to civil life (vers. 10-15); 3) to domestic life (vers. 16–31); it is therefore *justitia privata, publica, œconomica.*—STARKE:—The advantage which the pious have from their piety, and the injury which the wicked experience from their wickedness: 1) from righteousness and unrighteousness in business in general; 2) from good and evil conduct with respect to the honorable fame of one's neighbor (vers. 12, 13); 3) from good and evil government (vers. 14, 15); 4) from seeking or contemning true wisdom (vers. 16-23); 5) from beneficence or uncharitableness (vers. 24-31).

Vers. 1-11. MELANCHTHON (on ver. 1): Weight and balance are judicial institutions of the Lord, and every weight is His work. But marriage compacts also, political confederacies, civil compacts, judgments, penalties, *etc.*, are ordinances of Divine wisdom and justice, and are effectively superintended by God.—(on ver. 2): Usually in prosperity men become remiss both in the fear of God, and also in prayer. If in this way God's fear is at length wholly stifled, men in their carnal security allow themselves all manner of encroachments on the rights of their neighbor. Experience has, however, taught even the heathen that certain penalties do by Divine ordinance infallibly overtake such pride and arrogance when these pass beyond the bounds of one's calling, and they have therefore designated this law of the Divine administration of the world according to which pride is the sure precursor of a speedy fall by the expression ἀδράστεια, "inevitability." Comp. 1 Pet. v. 5 sq. [ARNOT: God claims to be in merchandize, and to have His word circling through all its secret channels.—BRIDGES: Commerce is a providential appointment for our social intercourse and mutual helpfulness. It is grounded with men upon human faith, as with God upon Divine faith.—JERMYN: Such a *perfect stone* is a perfect jewel, and a precious stone in the sight of God.—Ver. 2. TRAPP: The humble man, were it not that the fragrant smell of his many virtues betrays him to the world, would choose to live and die in his self-contenting secrecy.]—J. LANGE (on vers. 1-8): Pride and malignity are, so to speak, the first nurses of injustice in business, Ecclesiast. x. 15, 16.—[Ver. 6. TRAPP: Godliness hath many troubles, and as many helps against trouble.—Ver. 8. BRIDGES: The same providence often marks Divine faithfulness and retributive justice.]—GEIER (on vers. 7, 8): The righteous man is in the end surely free from his cross; if it does not come about as he wishes, then assuredly it does as is most useful for him; if not before his temporal death then in and by means of this.—(On vers. 10, 11). The growth and prosperity of a civil community is to be ascribed not so much to its political regulations as rather to the prayers of its pious citizens, who therefore deserve above others to be protected, honored and promoted.—J. LANGE (on vers. 10, 11). Pious and devout rulers of a city or a land are a great blessing, for which we should diligently pray, lest God should peradventure chastise us with tyrannical, selfish, ungodly masters.

Vers. 12-15. GEIER (on vers. 12, 13): Taciturnity is never too highly praised, nor is it ever thoroughly acquired. Disgraceful and injurious as loquacity is, equally admirable is true

Digitized by Google

reserve in speech.—(On ver. 14): The welfare of a land does indeed by all means depend on wise and faithful counsellors; yet to God, the supreme source of all prosperity, must the highest honor ever be rendered.—RUEDEL (on ver. 14—in ROHR's *Predigermagazin*): Means by which we all may work beneficially from our domestic upon the public life (by the fidelity of our action, by purity of morals, love of peace, and a genuine religious sensibility).—VON GERLACH (on ver. 14): In the affairs of a city, a state, a society, we should look far more after the spiritual than after the external means and appliances.—WOHLFARTH (on vers. 9-15): The blessing which the pious confers even here, and the curse that goes forth from the sinner.

Vers. 16-23. ZELTNER (on ver. 16): Zealous as tyrants are to acquire and keep their wealth, so diligent should the pious man be in attaining and preserving his true honor, which is the fear of God and virtue.—[ARNOT (on ver. 17): In every act that mercy prompts there are two parties, who obtain a benefit. Both get good, but the giver gets the larger share.—J. EDWARDS (on ver. 19): Solomon cannot mean *temporal* death, for he speaks of it as a punishment of the wicked, wherein the righteous shall certainly be distinguished from them.]—GEIER (on ver. 17): The gifts which have been received from God one may enjoy with a good conscience, only it must be done with a thankful heart in the fear of God, and in connection with it the poor may not be forgotten.—(On ver. 18): The hope of the ungodly is deceptive. For the object of their labor they do not attain, because death suddenly overtakes them (Luke xii. 19). Their accumulated wealth does not reach the heir of the third generation, they leave behind them an evil name, and the worm of conscience continually preys upon them.—(On ver. 22): External physical beauty without inner beauty of soul is like a whitewashed sepulchre, that within is full of dead men's bones. Matth. xxiii. 27.—[FLAVEL (on ver. 20): God takes great pleasure in uprightness, and will own and honor integrity amidst all the dangers which befall it.]—VON GERLACH (on ver. 22): Personal beauty is like the mere ornaments of an animal, attached to it only externally, and often standing in sharp contrast with itself; it is that within which makes the man a man.—*Berleburg Bible* (on ver. 23): The righteous desire nothing but what is good, and are by God really made partakers of these things which they desire. The ungodly, on the contrary, instead of what they hoped for, are made partakers of God's wrath.

Vers. 24-26. CRAMER: Almsgiving does not impoverish, as many men from lack of love suppose.—HASIUS: Though God may not requite our beneficence in every instance by increasing the abundance of our possessions, yet He does in this that it contributes to our true welfare.—VON GERLACH: God as invisible regulator of human fortunes stands behind visible causes; He bestows His blessing upon the insignificant and increases it, His curse upon the abundant, and it wastes away. Thus every where it is the deeper causes that determine advance in wealth or impoverishment. The blessing which we diffuse among others turns to our account; he who waters the dry land of others thereby brings advantage to his own.—[T. ADAMS (on ver. 24): The communication of this riches doth not impoverish the proprietary. The more he spends of his stock, the more he hath. But he that will hoard the treasure of his charity shall grow poor, empty and bankrupt.—ARNOT (on ver. 25): To be a vessel conveying refreshment from the fountain-head of grace to a fainting soul in the wilderness is the surest way of keeping your own spirit fresh, and your experience ever new.—TRAPP: Bounty is the most compendious way to plenty, neither is getting but giving the best thrift.—CHALMERS: God in return not only enriches and ministers food to such as have willingly parted with their carnal things, but increases the fruits of their righteousness.]

Vers. 27-31. STARKE (on ver. 27): The opportunity to do good one should not let slip from his hands, Gal. vi. 10. If thou art always deferring from one time to another, it is easy that nothing should come of it —(On ver. 28): If thou wilt be and continue truly prosperous, then seek eagerly the righteousness of Jesus Christ, and not the perishable riches and pleasures of this world.—(On ver. 30): To win gold and possessions is far from being so great wisdom as to win souls and deliver them from the way of destruction.—[TRAPP (on ver. 28): Riches were never true to any that trusted to them.—Lord BACON (on ver. 29): In domestical separations and breaches men do promise to themselves quieting of their mind and contentment; but still they are deceived of their expectation, and it turneth to wind.—J. EDWARDS (on ver. 31): The persecutions of God's people, as they are from the disposing hand of God, are chastisements for sin.—Bp. JOS. HALL (on ver. 31): Behold even the most just and holy man upon earth shall be sure of his measure of affliction here in the world; how much more shall the unconscionable and ungodly man be sure to smart for his wickedness, either here or hereafter.]—MELANCHTHON (on ver. 31): If even the righteous in this life suffer correction and affliction, which nevertheless tend to improvement, how much more surely will they who defiantly and fiercely persist in their sinful course be punished, if not in this life, then in the life to come (Luke xxiii. 31; 1 Pet. iv. 18).—VON GERLACH (on ver. 30): From the righteous there go forth life and blessing, as from a tree of life, wherefore he also gains ascendency over the souls of many, just as the tree of life was the centre of Paradise, and from it went forth the prosperity of the whole.

Digitized by Google

β) With reference to domestic, civil and public avocations.

CHAP. XII.

1 He that loveth correction loveth knowledge;
but whosoever hateth rebuke is brutish.
2 The good man obtaineth favor from Jehovah;
but the man of wicked devices doth he condemn.
3 A man shall not be established by wickedness;
but the root of the righteous shall not be moved.
4 A good wife is the crown of her husband,
but one that causeth shame is as rottenness in his bones.
5 The thoughts of the righteous are justice;
the counsels of the wicked are deceit.
6 The words of the wicked are a lying in wait for blood,
but the mouth of the upright delivereth them.
7 The wicked are overturned and are no more;
but the house of the righteous shall stand.
8 According to his wisdom shall a man be praised;
but he that is of a perverse heart shall be despised.
9 Better is the lowly that serveth himself,
than he that boasteth and lacketh bread.
10 The righteous careth for the life of his beast;
but the sympathy of the wicked is cruelty.
11 He that tilleth his land shall be satisfied with bread:
but he that followeth after vanity is void of understanding.
12 The wicked desireth the spoil of evil doers,
but the root of the righteous is made sure.
13 In the transgression of the lips is a dangerous snare,
but the righteous escapeth from trouble.
14 From the fruit of a man's mouth shall he be satisfied with good;
and the work of one's hands shall return to him.
15 The way of a fool is right in his own eyes,
but he that hearkeneth to counsel is wise.
16 The vexation of the fool is at once known;
but he that hideth offence is wise.
17 He that uttereth truth proclaimeth right,
but the lying tongue deceit.
18 There is that talketh idly like the piercings of a sword:
but the tongue of the wise is health.
19 The lip of truth shall be established forever;
but the lying tongue only for a moment.
20 Deceit is in the heart of those who devise evil,
but to those who give wholesome counsel is joy.
21 There shall no evil befall the righteous;
but the wicked are full of calamity.
22 Lying lips are an abomination to Jehovah;
but they that deal truly are his delight.
23 A prudent man hideth knowledge:
but the heart of fools proclaimeth foolishness.
24 The hand of the diligent shall rule:
but the slothful shall be obliged to serve.
25 If heaviness be in the heart of man it boweth it down;
a good word maketh it glad.

Digitized by Google

26 The righteous guideth his friend aright;
but the way of the wicked leadeth him astray.
27 The idle catcheth not his prey,
but a precious treasure to a man is diligence.
28 In the path of righteousness is life:
but a devious way (leadeth) to death.

GRAMMATICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 11.—רַחֲמֵי. [This plural is cited by BÖTTCHER, § 699, among the examples of that, ideally extended and abstract, which vividly and agreeably impresses the spirit, and therefore is fitly represented by a plural; comp. אַשְׁרֵי, *etc.*]

Ver. 17.—יָפִיחַ אֱמוּנָה (comp. יָפִיחַ כְּזָבִים, chap. vi. 19) is to be regarded as a relative clause. [BÖTTCHER, however, regards יָפִיחַ here and in vi. 19; xiv. 25; xix. 5, 9; Ps. xii. 6; xxvii. 12, as a Hiphil participle of peculiar form, found only in a few instances in connection with roots containing a labial that would closely follow the מ which is the ordinary prefix of the Hiphil participle. The omission of this מ gives a form approaching the Kal. BÖTTCHER objects to EWALD'S description of this as an intransitive Kal participle (§ 169, *a*), that this verb is not intransitive, *etc.* See § 994, 9 and 4).—A.]

Ver. 28.—An additional objection to the ordinary interpretation (see exegetical notes below) is the absence of Mappiq in the ה of נְתִיבָה, which must nevertheless be regarded as a third pers. suffix referring to צְדָקָה, "the way of its path."

EXEGETICAL.

1. Vers. 1-3. Three proverbs on the contrast between good and evil in general.—**Whosoever hateth correction is brutish.**—בַּעַר, *brutus*, stupid as a beast; a peculiarly strong expression. Comp. chaps. xxx. 2; Ps. xlix. 10; lxxiii. 22; xcii. 6. HITZIG prefers to read בֹּעֵר, which alteration, however, appears from the passages just cited to be unnecessary.—Ver. 2. **The good man obtaineth favor from Jehovah.** For the use of this verb "obtain" (lit. "to draw out") comp. iii. 13; viii. 35.—**But the man of wicked devices doth he condemn,**—*i. e.*, Jehovah. Others regard the verb as intransitive, *e. g.*, the Vulgate, "*impie agit*," and now HITZIG, who finds expressed here the idea of "incurring penalty." But for this signification of this Hiphil there is wanting the necessary illustration and support; and as evidence that the וְאִישׁ מְזִמּוֹת may be regarded as an accusative without the sign אֶת comp., *e. g.*, x. 11; Ps. lvi. 8; Job xxii. 29, *etc.*—With ver. 3 compare x. 25, and with the second clause in particular ver. 12 below.

2. Vers. 4-11. Eight proverbs on the blessings and banes of domestic life, and on the cause of both.—Ver. 4. **A good wife is her husband's crown.** Literally, a woman of power, *i. e.*, of moral power and probity, such as manifests itself in her domestic activity; comp. xxxi. 10; Ruth iii. 11. The "crown" or the garland (עֲטָרָה) is here regarded evidently as an emblem of honor and renown, comp. the "crown of rejoicing" (στέφανος καυχήσεως), 1 Thess. ii. 19; also Prov. xxxi. 23, 28.—**But like a rottenness in his bones is she that causeth shame.**—Literally a worm-eating, *i. e.*, a ruin inwardly undermining and slowly destroying; comp. xiv. 30; Job iii. 16.—Ver. 5. **The thoughts of the righteous are just; the counsels of the wicked are deceit,**—*i. e.*, the very thoughts of the pious, much more then their words and deeds, aim at simple justice and righteousness; the shrewd counsels, however, by which the wicked seek to direct others (תַּחְבֻּלוֹת, comp. xi. 14), are in themselves deceitful and unreal, and therefore lead solely to evil.—Ver. 6. **The words of the wicked are a lying in wait for blood,**—*i. e.*, they mean malice, they are the expression of a bloodthirsty and murderous disposition; comp. i. 11 sq.; xi. 9.—Altogether needlessly HITZIG alters the phrase אֱרָב־דָּם to אֹרֵב בָּם, "are a snare for them."—**The mouth of the righteous, however, delivereth them,**—that is, the righteous (comp. xi. 6), or it may be also the innocent who are threatened by the lying in wait of the wicked for blood (comp. xi. 9). [So WORDSW. and MUENSCHER].—Ver. 7. **The wicked are overturned and are no more.**—The infin. abs. הָפוֹךְ here stands emphatically for the finite verb, and furthermore, for this is certainly the simplest assumption, in an active or intransitive sense [comp. however in general on this idiom BÖTTCHER, § 990, *a.*—A.]; "the wicked turn about, then are they no more" [comp. the proverbial expression "in the turning of a hand"]. To regard it as a passive (EWALD, ELSTER, HITZIG) [K., M., S.] is unnecessary; this gives a stronger meaning than the poet probably designed, *i. e.*, "the wicked are overthrown" (or even "turned upside down," HITZIG). The subsequent clause "and are no more" would not harmonize with so strong a meaning in the antecedent clause, especially if, as HITZIG supposes, the verb really designs to remind us of the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen. xix. 21). With the second clause comp. x. 25; Matth. vii. 25.

Ver. 8. **According to his wisdom.**—לְפִי [literally "in the face or presence of"], "in proportion to," "according to the measure of," as in Judges i. 8 and frequently elsewhere.—**But he that is of a perverse heart shall be despised,**—lit., "the crooked in heart," *i. e.*, the perverse man, who does not see things as they are, and therefore acts perversely and injudiciously (HITZIG).

Ver. 9. **Better is the lowly that serveth himself.**—With this use of "lowly, insignificant," comp. 1 Sam. xviii. 23. The phrase

Digitized by Google

וְעֶבֶד לוֹ the Targum, ABEN EZRA, BERTHEAU, ELSTER [DE W., N., S.], regard as expressing this idea, "and he has at the same time a servant." But the parallelism demands the meaning early given in the LXX, Vulgate and Syr. versions [and now preferred by K., H., M., W.], "*ministrans sibi ipsi*," serving himself, which is here evidently put in contrast with the foolish, impoverished pride of birth mentioned in the second clause,—whether we retain the Masoretic reading, or, with ZIEGLER, EWALD and HITZIG, read וְעֹבֵד לוֹ (participial). — **And lacketh bread**.—Comp. 2 Sam. iii. 29. With the general sentiment compare the passage which undoubtedly grew out of this, Ecclesiast. x. 30.—Ver. 10. **The righteous careth for the life of his beast**,—*i. e.*, he knows how his beast feels, he concerns himself, he cares for his domestic animals, does not allow them to hunger. [ARNOT: When the pulse of kindness beats strong in the heart, the warm stream goes sheer through the body of the human family, and retains force enough to expatiate among the living creatures that lie beyond]. Comp. Ex. xxiii. 9, "Ye know the heart of the stranger," from which parallel passage it appears that ZIEGLER, ELSTER, *etc.*, are in the wrong in translating נֶפֶשׁ here by "hunger." For examples of this use of the verb יָדַע "to know," in the sense of "to concern one's self, to care for something," comp. also xxvii. 23; Gen. xxxix. 6; Ps. i. 6, *etc.*—**But the compassion of the wicked is cruelty**,—lit., "is cruel."—With the whole proverb comp. Ecclesiast. vii. 23.—Ver. 11. **But he that followeth after vanity**.—רֵיקִים is probably not the designation of "vain persons," as in Judg. ix. 4; 2 Sam. vi. 20; comp. 2 Kings iv. 8 (UMBREIT, BERTHEAU, *etc.*), but is to be regarded as neuter, *i. e.*, as an abstract, and therefore as meaning vain things, vanities, and, as the contrast with the first clause shows, specially "idleness, inaction, laziness." Comp. the LXX, who have here rendered the expression by μάταια, but in the passage almost literally identical, chap. xxviii. 19, by σχολήν; in like manner SYMMACHUS (ἀπραγίαν), Vulgate (*otium*), *etc.*

8. Vers. 12–22. Eleven additional proverbs with regard to virtues and faults in civil relations, especially sins of the tongue and their opposites.—**The wicked desireth the spoil of evil doers**,—*i. e.*, one wicked man seeks to deprive another of his gains, one of them is evermore seeking the injury and ruin of another, so that no peace prevails among them (Is. xlviii. 22; lvii. 21); they are rather "by the conflict of their selfish strivings ever consuming one another." Thus, and doubtless correctly, UMBREIT and ELSTER [to whose view K. gives a qualified assent], while BERTHEAU, following the Targum, translates מְצוֹד by "net," and to illustrate the meaning thus obtained, compares chap. viii. 35 [this is also the rendering of the E. V., which is followed by W., M., H.; S. renders "desireth an evil net," *i. e.*, destruction, being so intent upon his evil deeds as to disregard the consequences; N. renders in seeming agreement with our author "the prey of evil doers," the genitive being however possessive and not objective, *i. e.*, such prey as evil doers take]; EWALD however and HITZIG regard the passage as altogether corrupt, on account of the widely divergent text of the ancient versions (LXX, Vulg., Syr.), and therefore propose emendations (EWALD, "the desire of the wicked is an evil net;" HITZIG, "the refuge of the wicked is crumbling clay"). It is certainly noteworthy that the LXX and Vulgate offer a double rendering of the verse, first one that widely departs, and then one less seriously differing from the form of the Masoretic text.—With the second clause comp. ver. 8, second clause. For the verb יִתֵּן it is probably not needful to supply as subject the word "Jehovah," which has been omitted (UMBREIT, BERTHEAU, ELSTER [WORDSW. (?)], *etc.*) [nor with LUTHER, DE W., E. V., N. and M. to supply an object,—giveth or yieldeth (fruit)]; but, as in the instance in x. 24, to change the punctuation to the passive יֻתַּן, or again, to write יֵתָן (derived from יָתַן, *firmus fuit*, comp. the proper name אֵיתָן) with the Targum, REISKE, HITZIG [STUART], *etc.*—Ver. 13. **In the transgression of the lips is a dangerous snare**; *i. e.*, he who seeks to ruin others by evil speaking is himself overthrown in the same way. BERTHEAU proposes to construe so as to give the meaning "is a snare of or for the wicked," which, however, is contrary to the analogy of Eccles. ix. 12.—After this verse also the LXX introduces a peculiar addition consisting of two clauses, which, however, is probably nothing more than an old gloss on the following verse; comp. HITZIG on this passage.

Ver. 14. **From the fruit of a man's mouth is he satisfied with good**.—Lit., "from the fruit of the mouth of the man doth he satisfy himself with good;" *i. e.*, it is the good fruit which one brings forth in wise, intelligent, benevolent discourse, that results in blessing to him. Comp. xiii. 2; xviii. 20. In the second clause to good words good works are added, and as "returning upon him" (comp. Ps. vii. 16); they are therefore represented as being in a sense the personified bearers of reward and blessing. Compare the similar thought, referring however to future retributions, and therefore somewhat differently expressed, Rev. xiv. 18, "their works do follow them."—Vers. 15 and 16 belong together, as both refer to the fool and his opposite.—**The way of a fool is right in his own eyes**,—*i. e.*, according to his own judgment (comp. iii. 7), which presents to him his own mode of action in a light favorable enough, although others may ever so often, and in a way ever so convincing, point out its perverseness. The exact opposite of this is found in the conduct of the wise man, the willing listener to wise counsels. Comp. xiv. 12; xvi. 25; xxi. 2.—**The vexation of the fool is at once known**,—lit., "is known even on the same day," *i. e.*, at once, after a short time (Vulgate, *statim*). In contrast with this passionate breaking out of the offended fool, the wise man exercises a prudent self-control in a seemly disregard of the insult put upon him, as Saul once did, 1 Sam. x. 27.—Ver. 17. **He that uttereth truth proclaimeth right**, *i. e.*, always gives utterance to that which is strictly just; so

Digitized by Google

especially in judicial examinations as witness. This "truth" (אֱמוּנָה) is subjective truth, fidelity to one's own convictions (πίστις, LXX), the opposite to the lies which characterize the false witness; comp. xiv. 5, 25.

Ver. 18. **There is that talketh idly, as though it were thrusts of a sword**, lit., "like piercings of a sword," or "like knife thrusts" (HITZIG); *i. e.*, he breaks out with speeches so inconsiderate and inappropriate, that the persons present feel themselves injured as if by sharp thrusts. This rude and inconsiderate babbling of the fool is here fitly described by the verb בָּטָה, which is equivalent to בָּטָא, used in Lev. v. 4; Numb. xxx. 7; Ps. cvi. 33 (of speaking hastily, rashly, unadvisedly).—**But the tongue of the wise is health.**—"Medicine, healing" (comp. iv. 22), forms here an exceedingly appropriate antithesis to the inwardly wounding effect of the inconsiderate babbling mentioned before.

Vers. 19. **But the lying tongue only for a moment.**—Literally, "till I wink again, till I complete a wink of the eye;" comp. Jer. xlix. 19 and l. 44. This is therefore a detailed poetical circumlocution for the idea of a little while, an instant (Is. liv. 7): the verb here employed (הִרְגִּיעַ) is a denominative derived from רֶגַע a wink.—**Deceit is in the heart of those who devise evil.**—"Deceit, malignity" (comp. ver. 17, second clause) might here be made antithetic to "joy," because the necessary effect of deceit is sorrow and trouble. Therefore this noun מִרְמָה is not to be transformed to מְרֵרָה bitterness (HOUBIGANT), nor to be interpreted by "self-deception," or by "joy in evil" (*Schadenfreude*) with UMBREIT.—**But to those who give wholesome counsel is joy.**—The common rendering (as also that of UMBREIT, ELSTER, *etc.*), is "who counsel peace;" comp. the old reading of the LXX, οἱ βουλόμενοι εἰρήνην, and the εἰρηνοποιοί of Matth. v. 9. But שָׁלוֹם is here to be taken in the general sense of "welfare, that which is salutary," as, for example, in Ps. xxxiv. 14; xxxvii. 37. The special signification "peace" would not correspond with the "evil" of the first clause, which is nowhere equivalent to strife, division (not in Judges ix. 23, as UMBREIT thinks). The "joy" of the well-meaning counsellor is furthermore probably to be conceived of as one to be found in the heart, the inward cheerfulness and happy contentment of a good conscience (as HITZIG rightly maintains against BERTHEAU and others).

Ver. 21. **No evil befalleth the righteous.**—For this verb (Pual of אָנָה) comp. Ps. xci. 10; Ex. xxi. 13. אָוֶן here signifies not "sin," but "evil, misfortune, calamity," like the parallel term in the second clause, or the רָעָה in the 91st Psalm cited above.—With respect to the sentiment, which naturally should be regarded as a relative truth, not as unconditionally illustrated in every experience, comp. chap. x. 3; xi. 23; xii. 2, 3, *etc.*—With ver. 22 compare xi. 20. It is unnecessary to alter the plural עֹשֵׂי into the singular עֹשֵׂה (with the LXX, many MSS., HITZIG, *etc.*).

4. Vers. 23–28. Six proverbs which relate to the contrast between the wise and the foolish, the diligent and the slothful.—With reference to the first clause of ver. 23 compare x. 14, 17; with the second clause, xiii. 16; xv. 2.—Ver. 24. **The hand of the diligent will rule; but the slothful will be obliged to serve.**—With the first clause compare x. 4; with the second, xi. 29.—רְמִיָּה, "slothful," is doubtless an adjective belonging to the noun יָד (hand), and not an abstract substantive "sloth," standing here for the concrete, "the sluggard," as J. D. MICHAELIS, DÖDERLEIN, BERTHEAU and ELSTER suggest.—"Will be obliged to serve," literally, "will be for tribute, for service," *i. e.*, will be forced to labor as one owing tribute.—Ver. 25. **If trouble be in the heart of man it boweth it down.**—The suffix attached to the verb seems like that connected with the parallel verb, which, moreover, rhymes with this, to refer to the noun "heart," and this as a synonym with נֶפֶשׁ "soul," has here the force of a feminine. [BÖTTCHER, § 877, *e*, cites this among the examples of the use of the fem. singular as a neuter with reference to objects named before but conceived of as neuter. See also GREEN, § 197, *b*—A.] In this connection it is indeed remarkable that דְּאָגָה (trouble), also contrary to its natural gender, appears here construed as a masculine. Hence the varying views of many recent expositors, *e. g.*, that of UMBREIT and ELSTER; "if trouble be in a man's heart, let him repress it (the sorrow);" or that of HITZIG, who refers the suffixes of both these verbs to the noun "hand" of the verse preceding, and accordingly renders (at the same time in a peculiar way reproducing the rhyme):

"Is sorrow in the man's heart, he bends it (*i. e.*, the hand, down).
But if gladness, he extends it."

[HITZIG's rhyme is made with the verbs *senket* and *schwenket*, which are rather violent equivalents to the Hebrew terms, but are perhaps fairly matched by *bends* and *extends*, or *abases* and *raises*.—A.] In favor of the rendering which we prefer are the old versions, and among recent expositors ROSENMUELLER, DATHE, DÖDERLEIN, EWALD, BERTHEAU.

Ver. 26. **The righteous guideth his friend aright.**—The verb יָתֵר, Hiphil of הֵתֵר (which is equivalent to תּוּר), means "to set right, to guide to the right way, ὁδηγεῖν;" מֵרֵעַ is then equivalent to רֵעַ, friend, companion, as in Gen. xxvi. 26; Judges xiv. 20; xv. 6. [So GESEN., RÖD., FUERST, EWALD, BERTHEAU, K., S., M. and W.]—Others, especially LUTHER, M. GEIER, *etc.*, following the Chaldee version, regard יָתֵר as an adjective followed by the object of comparison: "better than his friend is (or fares) the righteous man." [So the E. V., which is followed by NOYES]. Others still, like DATHE, J. D. MICHAELIS, ZIEGLER and HITZIG (the latter changing the verb to יָתֻר), read מִרְעֵהוּ, "his pasture," and so reach the meaning "the righteous looketh after his pasture," *i. e.*, his path in life. It seems, however, altogether needless to depart from the above explanation, which is grammatically ad-

Digitized by Google

missible, and gives a meaning which agrees well with that of the second clause —**But the way of the wicked leadeth them astray**; them, *i. e.*, the wicked. The construction is the same as in chap. xi. 6, and probably also xii. 6.

Ver. 27. **The slothful catcheth not his prey.**—"The slothful," properly here again an adjective, "idle" hand, expresses the idea of sloth, and then, as an abstract for the concrete, stands for "the sluggard, the slothful." חָרַךְ then, an ἅπαξ λεγόμενον in the Old Testament, is explained by the Rabbins, following the Aramean (Dan. iii. 27), by "to singe, to roast;" therefore BERTHEAU, *e. g.*, still translates "the slothful roasteth not his prey," and then supplies the idea, "because he is too lazy to catch it." [M. adopts this explanation, and S. doubtfully.] Others, more simply, and in conformity with the old versions, render "the idle man catcheth not his game" [so K., H., and N.], for which signification of hunting, catching, seizing, HITZIG cites lexical analogies from the Arabic. [FUERST, criticising this interpretation, and defending the other, urges 1) that not to catch game is no sure sign of laziness, and 2) "his prey" must be already in hand—A.]—**But a precious treasure to a man is diligence.**—To reach this meaning it is necessary either to take חָרוּץ exceptionally in the abstract sense of diligence, or with C. B. MICHAELIS and HITZIG to read as an infinitive חָרוֹץ, "to bestir one's self, to show one's self diligent."—Others, like KÖHLER, UMBREIT, ELSTER, *etc.*, resort to a partial transposition of the words, yielding the meaning "but precious treasure belongeth to the diligent man"—an alteration which is favored in advance by the Syriac version, and to some extent also by the LXX.

Ver. 28. **But a devious way** (leadeth) **to death.**—This is doubtless the interpretation to be given with HITZIG to this clause: for in Judges v. 6; Is. lviii. 12, נְתִיבָה in fact signifies (in contrast with אֹרַח) a crooked winding by-path, and the modification of אַל to אֶל seems the more justifiable in proportion as the combination on which the ordinary rendering rests is otherwise unknown (אַל־מָוֶת as equivalent to לֹא־מָוֶת); "and the way of its path is not-death" (which is to be understood as "immortality," EWALD, UMBREIT, ELSTER [K., E. V., N., S., M.], *etc.*). Furthermore, the form of expression (דֶּרֶךְ before נְתִיבָה) indicates plainly that to the second of the terms employed not its ordinary sense, but a quite peculiar signification, a quasi adjective import is to be given. [HODGSON and HOLDEN express a decided preference for this view].—With the general sentiment of the verse compare x. 2; xi. 19.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

The contrasts between diligence and indolence, wisdom and folly, which present themselves as the strongest characteristics of the second and fourth of the groups of verses found in this chapter, lead us to refer the proverbs of these groups mainly to *private* or *domestic* life,—while the predominating reference of the third main group (vers. 12–22) to sins of the tongue or lips, leads us to regard *social* or *civil* life as the special department here chiefly contemplated. Still this classification is after all only a general one, and proverbs of a more general moral tendency and bearing, like those contained in the introductory group (vers. 1–3) are interspersed through each of the three large groups (*e. g.* in vers. 5, 6, 12, 21, 26, 28): these therefore show the impossibility of carrying through a division of the contents of the chapter according to definite and clearly distinct categories.

Moral truths to which an emphatic prominence is given are found in the very first verse, on which UMBREIT pertinently remarks, "The thought seems weak, and to a spirit practised in reflection hardly worth recording, yet on its truth rests the possibility of a spiritual progress in the human race, its development to a higher humanity; one might even say, the very conditions of history lie in that proverb." Again we find them in ver. 10, a proverb which sets forth that tender care for animals as man's fellow-creatures, which impresses itself on so many other passages of the Old Testament, *e. g.* Ex. xx. 11; xxii. 29, 30; Lev. xxii. 27; Deut. xxii. 6 sq.; xxv. 4; Ps. xxxvi. 6; civ. 27; cxlv. 15 sq.; cxlvii. 9; Job xxxviii. 39 sq.; xxxix. 5 sq.; Jonah iv. 11, *etc.**

We find like important truths in ver. 13, as also in general in all the proverbs that relate to the right use of the lips and tongue (compare besides vers. 14, 16–19, 22, 25); so also in the commendation of a willingness to receive good counsel, ver. 15, with which we may appropriately compare THEOGNIS, *Gnom.*, V., 221–225 (see the passage in UMBREIT, p. 158);—and again in the admonition to a wise self-command and presence of mind under experience of injury, ver. 16, with which should be compared admonitions of the New Testament against persistent anger and heat of passion, such as Rom. xii. 19; Eph. iv. 26, 31; James i. 19, 20, *etc.*—It has already been made evident that the concluding verse of the chapter (ver. 28, 2d clause) unlike chapter xi. 7, probably contains no hint of a hope of immortality.

HOMILETIC AND PRACTICAL.

Homily on the entire chapter. On the true wisdom of the children of God, as it ought to appear 1) in the *home*, under the forms of good discipline, diligence and contentment; 2) in the *state* or in the intercourse of citizens, under the forms of truthfulness, justice, and unfeigned benevolence (ver. 12–22); 3) in the *Church* or in the religious life, as a progressive knowledge of God, a diligent devotion to prayer and striving after eternal life (vers. 23–28).—Comp. STÖCKER:—On true discipline: 1) its general utility (vers. 1–8); 2) the blessing on those who receive discipline, and the curse on those who hate and despise it (vers. 9–16); 3) comprehensive repetition of what has been taught concerning the salutariness of discipline (vers. 17–28).—STARKE:—On the injurious nature of ungodliness and

* Comp. ZÖCKLER, *Theologia Naturalis, Entwurf einer systematischen Naturphilosophie, etc.*, I., pp. 539 sq.

Digitized by Google

the utility of piety; 1) in general (vers. 1–3); 2) in particular, *a*) in the marriage relation (ver. 4); *b*) in common life (vers. 5–8); *c*) in the care of cattle and in agriculture (9–11); *d*) in the use of the tongue (12-23; *e*) in attention to one's calling (24-28).—*Calwer Handbuch:*—The heart, the action and the speech of the fool and the wise man —or, of the life that is to be found in the way of righteousness, and the ruin that is to be found in the way of ungodliness.

Vers. 1-3. GEIER:—No one is so perfect that he might not sometimes fail, and consequently need a chastisement not only on the part of God, but also on the part of men.—(On ver. 3): He who by faith and love is rooted in God (Eph. iii. 17) will not possibly ever be rooted up by anything; Ps. lxxiii. 25; John x. 28.—STARKE:—It is better to be with true sympathy chastised by a just man, than to be deceitfully praised.—*Berleburg Bible:*—He who suffers himself to be guided comes constantly nearer to wisdom, *i. e.* to Christ, and for such a one His fellowship with all its blessedness stands open.—VON GERLACH (on ver. 1):—All that raises man above the brute is secured to him by training, by the wholesome discipline of his parents and teachers.—(On ver. 3): The ungodly has no ground in which he is rooted, no stability in assaults from without, while the righteous man is rooted in the eternal nature of the Creator Himself. Hence the righteous man is a tree by a river's side, a house on a rock,—the ungodly, however, is a fleeting storm-cloud, a tree in a dry land, a house built on the sand, and even chaff that the wind driveth away, Ps. i. 3 sq.; Isa. xliv. 4, *etc.* —[ARNOT (on ver. 1):—The fool casts away the precious because it is unpalatable, and the wise man accepts the unpalatable because it is precious. Nature hates reproof; let grace take the bitter potion and thrust it down nature's throat, for the sake of its healing power.—A. FULLER (on ver. 1):—He, and he only, that loves the means loves the end. The means of knowledge are "instruction" in what is right, and "reproof" for what is wrong. He who is an enemy to either of these means is an enemy to the end. —BRIDGES (on ver. 3):—Firm and unshaken is the condition of *the righteous*. Their leaves may wither in the blast. Their branches may tremble in the fury of the tempest. But *their root*—the true principle of life—*shall not be moved*].

Vers. 4-11. GEIER (on ver. 4):—By vicious conduct a woman destroys her husband as it were with subtle poison, but even then harms herself the most.—ZELTNER (on. ver. 4):—He who will enter into the marriage relation should begin with God, with hearty prayer, sound reflection, and devout purposes, lest he be compelled afterward bitterly to bewail his folly, Tob. viii. 4 sq.—(On ver. 9): An honorable life in narrow circumstances is much better and more peaceful, and besides not subject to so many temptations, as when one lives in ever so high a position in the view of the world. To make a great figure and to aim at being great is the ruin of many a man, Tob. iv. 14; Ecclesiast. iii. 19, 30.—*Würtemberg Bible* (on ver. 10):—The brute has no one that can do him good but man; therefore treat it kindly, with reason and moderation.—[TRAPP (on ver. 5):—If good thoughts look into a wicked heart, they stay not there, as those that like not their lodging.—(On ver. 7): There is a council in heaven will dash the mould of all contrary counsels upon earth.—(On ver. 11): Sin brought in sweat (Gen. iii. 19), and now not to sweat increaseth sin.—LORD BACON (on ver. 10):—The tender mercies of the wicked are when base and guilty men are spared that should be stricken with the sword of justice. Pity of this sort is more cruel than cruelty itself. For cruelty is exercised upon individuals, but this pity, by granting impunity, arms and sends forth against innocent men the whole army of evil-doers.—CHALMERS (on ver. 10):—The lesson is not the circulation of benevolence within the limits of one species. It is the transmission of it from one species to another. The first is but the charity of a world. The second is the charity of a universe].

Vers. 12-22. MELANCHTHON:—In everything are we exhorted to good, and to striving after truth, in the knowledge of God, in science and arts, in all honorable occupations and compacts; and because truthfulness belongs to the most glorious and eminent virtues, therefore the vice opposed to it is condemned in strong language, and pronounced (ver. 22) an offence and abomination in the sight of God.—OSIANDER:—We use the gift of speech rightly when we employ it to God's glory and to our neighbor's benefit.—ZELTNER:—As one has here used his tongue, whether for good or evil, he will hereafter be recompensed. Truth is a daughter of righteousness; apply thyself diligently to this, and thou hast the true witness in thyself that thou art of the truth and a child of God (1 John iii. 18, 19). Fidelity and veracity have indeed in the world, whose watchword is only hatred, a poor reward; but so much the more precious are they in the sight of God (Ps. xv. 1, 2).—[ARNOT (on ver. 13): When a man is not true, the great labor of his life must be to make himself appear true; but if a man be true, he need not concern himself about appearances.—TRAPP (on ver. 20):—Such counsellors shall have peace for peace: peace of conscience for peace of country].—On ver. 20, TISCHER (in ZIMMERMAN'S "*Sonntagsfeier*," 1835, No. 41):—Every one can become acquainted with himself from his social intercourse.—[SOUTH (on ver. 22):—A lie is a thing absolutely and intrinsically evil: it is an act of injustice, and a violation of our neighbor's right. The vileness of its nature is equalled by the malignity of its effects; it first brought sin into the world, and is since the cause of all those miseries and calamities that disturb it; it tends utterly to dissolve and overthrow society, which is the greatest temporal blessing and support of mankind; it has a strange and peculiar efficacy, above all other sins, to indispose the heart to religion. It is as dreadful in its punishments as it has been pernicious in its effects].

Vers. 23–28. HASIUS:—The ordinary modes of acquisition are always the safest and best. Him who loves crooked ways and devices we never find prospering; but those who walk in ways of innocence and justice, cannot become unsuccessful.—OSIANDER:—Follow thy calling in the fear of God and with diligence, and thy possessions will be with God's blessing richly

Digitized by Google

multiplied.—STARKE:—He who squanders time, shuns toil and buries his pound in a napkin, is unworthy to dwell on earth (Luke xix. 20, 24).—WOHLFARTH (on ver. 25):—*The friendly word.* Where we can help by actual deeds, such real help is by all means better than mere consolation in words. If however the means for such aid are wanting to us, if the evil is of such a sort that no human help whatever is possible, then it is a double duty to cheer the depressed with friendly words; yes, consolation is then often in itself help because it leads to God, the true helper in all need!—[TRAPP (on ver. 27):—Jabal and Jubal, diligence and complacence, good husbandry and well contenting sufficiency, dwell usually together.—CHALMERS (on ver. 28): —The deeds of the hand have a reflex influence on the state of the heart. There is life in spiritual-mindedness; and it serves to aliment this life to walk in the way of obedience].

γ) **With reference to the use of temporal good, and of the word of God as the highest good.**

CHAP. XIII.

1 A wise son hearkeneth to his father's correction,
but a scorner to no rebuke.
2 By the fruit of one's mouth doth he enjoy good,
but the delight of the ungodly is violence.
3 He that guardeth his mouth keepeth his life,
he that openeth wide his lips shall be destroyed.
4 The sluggard desireth, but without the satisfying of his desire,
but the desire of the diligent is abundantly satisfied.
5 Deceit the righteous hateth,
but the ungodly acteth basely and shamefully.
6 Righteousness protecteth an upright walk,
but wickedness plungeth into sin.
7 One maketh himself rich and hath nothing,
another professeth to be poor yet hath great riches.
8 A ransom for a man's life are his riches,
but the poor heedeth no threatening.
9 The light of the righteous rejoiceth,
but the lamp of the wicked goeth out.
10 By pride cometh only contention,
but wisdom is with those who receive counsel.
11 Gain through fraud vanisheth away,
but he that gathereth by labor increaseth it (his gain).
12 Hope deferred maketh the heart sick,
but desire accomplished is a tree of life.
13 Whosoever despiseth the word is bound to it,
he that feareth the commandment is rewarded.
14 The instruction of the wise man is a fountain of life
to escape the snares of death.
15 Kindly wisdom ensureth favor,
the way of the ungodly is desolate.
16 The prudent man doeth all things with understanding,
but a fool spreadeth abroad folly.
17 A bad messenger falleth into trouble,
but a faithful messenger is health.
18 Poverty and shame (to him) that refuseth correction;
he that regardeth reproof is honored.
19 Quickened desire is sweet to the soul,
and it is abomination to fools to depart from evil.
20 Walk with wise men and become wise!
but whoso delighteth in fools becometh base.

Digitized by Google

21 Evil pursueth sinners,
but to the righteous God repayeth good.
22 A good man leaveth an inheritance to his children's children,
and the wealth of the sinner is laid up for the just.
23 The poor man's new land (yieldeth) much food,
but many a one is destroyed by iniquity.
24 He that spareth his rod hateth his son,
but whoso loveth him seeketh correction.
25 The upright eateth to the satisfying of his hunger,
but the belly of the wicked shall want.

GRAMMATICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 2. [The literal rendering is "*the soul of the wicked* (shall feed upon) *violence*." Substantially this rendering is given by the E. V., by H., N., S. and M. Zöckler [see exeg. notes] regards this verse as conveying the two ideas that violence is the wicked man's delight, and that it is his recompense. He feeds on it while he lives, and dies by it. Conceiving the former to be the more prominent idea here he gives to נֶפֶשׁ a secondary and figurative meaning,—the *longing*, the *delight*. We think that he has lost rather than gained by this refining.—A.]

Ver. 4. According to the Masoretic punctuation the clause would be literally rendered "His soul—the sluggard's—longeth [strongly desireth], and there is nothing," ["His appetite." Z.] The suffix in נַפְשׁוֹ would then stand pleonastically before the appended genitive עָצֵל [as *e. g.* Num. xxiv. 3; Deut. xxxii. 43]; וָאַיִן would however be introduced as a parenthesis between the predicate and the subject, and would express substantially the idea "without satisfaction, without finding anything." It appears simpler and less forced, however, to change the punctuation as Hitzig does, thus: מִתְאַוָּה וָאַיִן נַפְשׁוֹ עָצֵל, in which case נֶפֶשׁ receives the meaning by metonymy "object of desire" (comp. Ps. xxxv. 25; Isa. lviii. 19), and the meaning of the whole clause is as in our version.

Ver. 5. [יַבְאִישׁ, which Z. regards as equivalent to יָבִישׁ. Bött. (see § 1147, *C. b.*) regards as substituted for it by a mere interchange of weak and kindred consonants. The verbs are nearly related, בָּאַשׁ being used of that which is o ensive to the sense of smell, בּוֹשׁ of that which changes color, by turning pale or otherwise. The one describes misconduct as offensive, the other as shameful.—A.]

Ver. 9. The verb יִדְעָךְ seems to form a designed accord with יִשְׂמָח; comp. xii. 25.

Ver. 11. [The different renderings grow partly out of different conceptions of the meaning of the noun הֶבֶל and partly from different syntactical constructions. הֶבֶל, originally "breath," then "nothingness" or "vanity," is by most interpreters taken in some metaphorical sense. The rendering of the E. V., followed by H., is ambiguous, "by or through vanity." M. and St. render "without effort;" Fuerst agrees with Z. in giving it an ethical meaning,—that which is morally nothing, nothing right, nothing good. It so describes fraud and iniquity. Gesen., Noyes, *etc.*, retain the primitive meaning, and treat the מִן as comparative. See Exeg. Notes.—A.]

Ver. 15. [The rendering of שֵׂכֶל־טוֹב in the E. V., is again ambiguous: "good understanding." H., N., S., M. agree substantially with Z., interpreting the phrase as descriptive of prudence or discretion joined with kindness. Others, *e. g.* Fuerst, give it, with less probability, the passive meaning of "consideration" or "reputation."—A.]

Ver. 16. Instead of כָּל־ we should read כֹּל, in accordance with the correct rendering of the Vulg.: *Astutus omnia agit cum consilio.* [The English commentators without exception, so far as we know, follow the E. V. and the LXX, translate according to the pointing of the Mas. text: πᾶς πανοῦργος; "every wise man," *etc.* Z.'s rendering is certainly more forcible, and justifies the vowel change.—A.]

Ver. 19. [The weight of authority has been decidedly against the author's conception of the poetic נִהְיָה. Gesen. and Fuerst are against him, as well as the commentators cited. Kamph. may be added to those who agree with Z. in rendering this Niph. participle "become" as meaning "come into being," "developed," while the other conception is that it describes what has been "completed, accomplished." Comp. ver. 12, *b*, "desire that hath come," which is generally understood to be satisfaction. We cannot think that the proverb relates to the pleasure of desiring, but to that of being satisfied. The 2d clause is by H. regarded as an inference, "therefore," *etc.;* E. V., N , S., M. regard it as an antithesis—notwithstanding their certain disappointment fools cling to evil. K. shapes the antithesis differently: "a new desire is pleasant to the soul, but if it be evil fools abhor to renounce it." Z.'s view appears in the notes.—A.]

Ver. 20. [For the imper. use of the inf. abs. see Green § 268, 2 and grammars generally. יֵרוֹעַ Niph. Imperf., more distinct than יֵרַע which might be a neuter Kal. Bött. § 1147, A.—A.]

EXEGETICAL.

1. With chap. xiii Hitzig would have a new section commence, extending to chap. xv. 32, and consisting of three subdivisions of symmetrical structure. The first of these subdivisions would be chap. xiii., consisting of four groups of six verses each; the second, chap. xiv., five groups of seven verses each; the third, chap. xv., four groups of eight verses each—altogether 91 verses, precisely the same number as the preceding Section (chaps. x.-xii.) contained.—How arbitrary these assumptions are appears partly from the difficulties, often utterly insuperable, which meet the attempts to point out real divisions at the beginning and end of the several alleged groups of verses. It appears further from the fact that here again it is necessary to stamp as spurious one verse at least (xiii. 23), a violent critical expedient to secure the symmetrical relation of groups that is demanded. Comp. above, Exeget. notes on chap. x., No. 1.

With respect to the groups of verses that do develop themselves with satisfactory distinctness, and in general with reference to the order and progress of thought in the chapter before us, see the Doctrinal and Ethical notes.

Digitized by Google

2. Vers. 1-3. Three introductory proverbs, general in their import.—**A wise son hearkeneth to his father's correction.**—In this first clause we must supply "hearkeneth" from the second as predicate. The conception of others, *e. g.* J. D. MICHAELIS, BERTHEAU, *etc.:* A wise son is his father's correction, *i. e.* the object of his correction,—is less natural on account of its harshness. Parallel to the milder expression "instruction, correction" (מוּסָר) in clause *a*, we have in *b* the stronger term "rebuke" (גְּעָרָה, as in xvii. 10).—No rebuke, no threatening, no earnest enforcement of law makes any impression on the "scorner" (i. 22; ix. 7), the heedless reviler of religion, who has long ago thrown aside all childlike piety, and reverence for the holy. With ver. 2. clause *a*, comp. xii. 14; with *b* comp. x. 6.—**The delight of the ungodly is violence,** *i. e.* the eager desire (נֶפֶשׁ) of maliciously disposed sinners is for violence (חָמָס), which they wish to exercise upon others, and which therefore in turn recompenses them. "Violence," therefore, stands here with a twofold meaning [active and passive] as in chap. x. 6. [See Critical Notes].—**Shall be destroyed.**—מְחִתָּה, *ruina*, "destruction," just as in x. 14.—["Take heed that thy tongue cut not thy throat;" an Arabic proverb quoted by TRAPP from SCALIGER, *Arab. Prov.* i. 75.—A.]

3. Vers. 4-12. Nine proverbs relating mainly to the worth and right use of wealth.—**The sluggard desireth, but without the satisfying of his desire.**—[See Critical Notes].—**But the desire of the diligent is abundantly satisfied,** literally, "is made fat," comp. xi. 25.—Ver. 5. **Deceit the righteous hateth.**—דְּבַר־שֶׁקֶר appears to be not "word of falsehood," deceitful language (UMBREIT, BERTHEAU), but a designation of everything falling under the category of the deceitful (דבר being therefore equivalent to πρᾶγμα); comp. Ps. xli. 9; Isa. xliv. 4; it means therefore lies and frauds, deceit.—**But the ungodly acteth basely and shamefully.** [See Critical Notes]. יַבְאִישׁ, lit., "maketh offensive, stinking," stands here as equivalent to יָבִישׁ, "acteth basely, or causeth shame;" comp. chap. xix. 26. The Hiphil form יַחְפִּיר, which is found also in the parallel passage, here has an active meaning, "acteth shamefully," while in Isa. liv. 4 it stands as passive: cometh to shame, or is put to shame. [So the E. V., H., N, and M., while S., K., *etc.*, give the causative rendering—A.].

Ver. 6. **Righteousness protecteth an upright walk,** lit., "innocence of way," an abstract for the concrete, and therefore equivalent to "such as walk uprightly" (comp. x. 29). **But wickedness plungeth into sin.**—Wickedness (רִשְׁעָה), literally, "perverse, malicious disposition" describes that evil state of the heart which necessarily leads to sinful action (חַטָּאת). The verb, which is here used in its natural meaning, "overturn, plunge into something," has the end of its action, sin, connected with it without a preposition (comp. xix. 13). The old versions, and among modern expositors BERTHEAU, [FUERST, H., N., M., S.], take the object as an abstract for the concrete, and therefore translate "wickedness overthroweth sinners," by which rendering a more exact parallelism between *a* and *b*, it is true, is secured.

Ver. 7. **One maketh himself rich, and hath nothing at all.**—Comp. xii. 9, a maxim, which, like the one before us, is aimed at foolish pride of birth and empty love of display on the part of men without means. The "boasting one's self" there corresponds with the "representing one's self rich" here. Comp. also the similar proverb of the Arabs, in MEIDANI, III. 429. [The second clause is differently understood; W. interprets it as referring to the "being rich in good works, and sacrificing all worldly things for God and His truth." So HOLDEN; while TRAPP, BRIDGES, N., S. and M. regard the clause as referring to the deceitful concealment of riches. The parallelism requires this view.—A.]

Ver. 8. **A ransom for a man's life are his riches,** *i. e.* the rich man can and under certain circumstances, as *e. g.* before a court, or when taken captive by robbers or in war, must employ his wealth for his ransom.—**But the poor heedeth no threatening,** *i. e.* no warning or threatening however sharp ("rebuke" as in ver. 1) will be able to force anything from him who has nothing: the poor is deaf to every threat that aims at the diminution of his possessions, for "where there is nothing, there the Emperor has lost his rights." The spirit of this maxim, in itself morally indifferent, seems like that of the similar proverb, chap. x. 15, to be directed to the encouragement of industry, and of some earthly acquisitions though they be but moderate. ELSTER is certainly in the wrong, in holding that the proverb depicts, not without a shade of irony, "the advantages as well of great wealth as of great poverty." Against various other conceptions of the verse, especially of clause *b*, comp. BERTHEAU *in loco.* [HOLDEN construes interrogatively: "Doth not the poor," *etc.*, understanding it of the helplessness of the poor; N. and M. understand it of the safety of the poor in his poverty; W. of his light-hearted independence; S. of the viciously or heedlessly poor, whom nothing can arouse to virtuous industry.—A.]

Ver. 9. **The light of the righteous burneth joyously.**—The verb is here intransitive: "is joyous, *i. e.* burns brightly, with vigorous blaze." HITZIG rightly directs attention to the fact that the same root (שׂמח) in Arabic signifies to "laugh, or sport."—**But the lamp of the wicked goeth out.** The "lamp" of the wicked (נֵר) does not seem to be emphatically contrasted as a dim night lamp with the bright light of the righteous, but is probably a simple synonym of אוֹר determined by the parallelism; comp. Job xviii. 5, 6; xxi. 17; xxii. 28; xxix. 3.

Ver. 10. **By pride cometh only contention.**—"Only" (רַק) although in the Hebrew put first in the clause, belongs nevertheless to the subject (מַצָּה), and not to the "by pride" בְּזָדוֹן [as in E. V., and STUART]; as though the mean-

Digitized by Google

ing were, only by pride (or, only in excitement, ebullition of passion, Umbreit) does one begin strife. Comp. rather as an example of this prefixing of "only" (רַק), Ps. xxxii. 6 [where Hupfeld and others do not admit this explanation "only to him," *etc.*]; and for similar hyperbata with גַּם and אַךְ comp. Prov. xix. 2; xx. 11; Isa. xxxiv. 14. [N. and M. agree with our author. H. takes רַק as a noun, "ignorance" with pride, *etc.* But if it be objected to the simple and obvious rendering of the words in their Hebrew order, that pride is not the only or chief cause of contention, it may no less be objected that contention is not the only or chief result of pride. Why may not the proverb be interpreted as comparing two dispositions, the proud, self-sufficient spirit, of clause *a*, and the modest inclination to consult and consider others, of clause *b*? Only by the former of these two is contention produced.—A.]—**But wisdom is with those who receive counsel.**—Comp. xii. 15, *b*. Instead of נוֹעָצִים, "the well advised, those who hearken to counsel," Hitzig proposes to read צְנוּעִים, the "modest." An unnecessary change to correspond with xi. 2.

Ver. 11. **Gain through fraud vanisheth away.**—[See Critical Notes]. The הוֹן מֵהֶבֶל is used to describe "gain coming from nothingness, from the unreal," *i. e.* secured in an unsubstantial, inconsiderate, fraudulent way (Ewald, Luther, *etc.*). Or (with Ziegler, Döderlein, Elster, Hitzig) let the pointing be מְהֻבָּל (Pual part.); *i. e.* a hastily, fraudulently acquired wealth, *substantia festinata*, Vulg.—To regard מֵהֶבֶל as a comparative, "sooner than a breath" (Umbreit, Noyes and others), has this against it,—that a "vanishing away," a "diminution" cannot be well predicated of a הֶבֶל, a nothing, a mere phantom, but may be naturally of a possession gained in an unsubstantial or unworthy manner.—**But he that gathereth by labor increaseth it.**—עַל־יָד is either "handful after handful" (Ewald, Bertheau, Elster, *etc.*), or, "according to his ability," *pro portione s. mensura sua* (Hitzig). In both cases it describes the gradual and progressive accumulation of wealth, resulting from diligence and exertion, and so is in significant contrast with the impatient dishonesty of the preceding clause.

Ver. 12. **Hope deferred maketh the heart sick**; comp. x. 28. The predicate is not a substantive, "sickness of heart" (Umbreit), but a Hiph. partic.—For the figure of the "tree of life" in clause *b* comp. xi. 30. ["Desire that hath come," (Kal part.) is by common consent of lexicographers and commentators desire accomplished. This should be remembered in the exposition of ver. 19 *a*.—A.]

4. Vers. 13-17. Five proverbs relating to the value of the divine word as the highest good, and exhorting to obedience to it.—**Whosoever despiseth the word is in bonds to it**, *i. e.* the word or the law of God (comp. for this absolute use of the term "word" (דבר) *e. g.*, xvi. 20). The word of divine revelation is here, as it were, personified as a real superhuman power, whose service one cannot escape, and in default of this he comes in bondage to it, *i. e.* loses his liberty. [The verb according to this rendering describes mortgages, bonds and other such legal obligations; "*wird verpfändet*," Z.—A.] Thus Schultens, Ewald, Elster correctly render, while many others, *e. g.* Umbreit, Bertheau, [K., E. V., N., S., M.] explain "for him is destruction provided, he shall be destroyed." Hitzig, however, altogether arbitrarily takes the "word" of clause *a* in the sense of "command," and the "command" (מִצְוָה) of clause *b* in the sense of "prohibition," and accordingly translates "whosoever despiseth the command is seized by it, and whoso avoideth (heedeth) the prohibition is rewarded" (?). For the phrase "he is requited, to him is requital," comp. xi. 31.

Ver. 14. **The instruction of the wise man is a fountain of life.**—Comp. x. 11, where the "mouth of the righteous," and xiv. 27, where the fear of God is described by this figure. In the latter passage the 2d clause of our verse appears again. "Snares of death" an established formula for the description of mortal perils; comp. Ps. xviii. 5; Prov. xxi. 6, and also the Latin *laquei mortis*. Hor. *Od.* III. 24, 8.

Ver. 15. **Kindly wisdom produceth favor.**—Comp. iii. 4, where however the שֶׂכֶל־טוֹב expresses a somewhat different idea, viz., passively, "good reputation." [See Critical Notes].—**The way of the ungodly is desolate.**—אֵיתָן, *perennis*, elsewhere descriptive of a brook or river that flows inexhaustibly, seems here to denote either a "standing bog" (J. D. Michaelis, Umbreit), or, which is perhaps more natural, it belongs as an adjective to the noun "way" (דֶּרֶךְ), and characterizes the way of transgressors as "ever trodden," *i. e.* altogether hard, solid, and therefore desolate and unfruitful (Bertheau, Ewald, Elster, *etc.*). [As compared with the more common conception of the hard way as rough, stony (Fuerst, H., S., M., W.) this has the advantage of following more naturally from the radical idea of continuance and permanence.—A.] Hitzig prefers to read אֵידָן, makes hateful, produces hatred (?). [This is Noyes' explanation].

Ver. 16. [See Critical Notes]. For the meaning "the wise man doeth all things with understanding," comp. xii. 23; xv. 2.—Ver. 17. **A bad messenger falleth into trouble.**—A "bad messenger" (lit., "wicked") is not, as might be thought, one who is indolent, tardy, as in x. 26 (so Bertheau), but one who is faithless, not true to his master, betraying him. He "falls into trouble" as a punishment for his faithlessness. Arnoldi and Hitzig unnecessarily substitute the Hiphil for the Kal, and render "throws into trouble." The antithesis between *a* and *b* is at any rate not an exact one.—**But a messenger of fidelity, a faithful messenger.**—Comp. xiv. 5; xx. 6, and for this participial form of the epithet, xxv. 13.—For this use of "health," healing medicine, comp. xii. 18.

Digitized by Google

5. Vers. 18-25. Eight additional admonitory proverbs, pointing to the blessedness of obedience to the divine word.—**Poverty and shame (to him) that refuseth correction.**—The participial clause is to be taken as conditional, "if one refuses correction" (comp. Job xli. 18). The connection with the main clause is "not grammatically complete, because intelligible of itself," comp. Prov. xxvii. 7 (HITZIG). For the meaning of the verb comp. i. 25; iv. 15; viii. 33.—With clause *b* comp. xv. 5, 32.

Ver. 19. **Quickened desire is sweet to the soul.**—[See Critical Notes.] "Desire that has come to be" (Niph. part.) cannot be designed to describe "appeased desire" (Vulg., LUTHER, BERTHEAU, EWALD, ELSTER [FUERST, H., N., S., M., *etc.*], but, as the import of clause *b* and a comparison of 12, *b* suggest, a desire that is just originated, has just attained its development, now first vividly experienced but not yet satisfied (UMBREIT, HITZIG). Now that this desire is in many instances directed toward evil, and that this evil desire is especially hard to appease,—this is the truth to which clause *b* gives expression (comp. James i. 14, 15). The second clause is not then antithetically related to the first, but it makes strongly prominent a single side of the general truth already uttered. [To what is said in the Critical Notes RUEETSCHI's comment may be added (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1868, p. 139). He renders clause *a* like the Vulg., E. V., *etc.*, regarding it as the statement of a general psychological fact, while *b* supplies a particular case, illustrative and not contrasted. His practical use of the sentiment of the proverb is embodied in the appeal "Therefore see to it that thy desire be a good one in whose accomplishment thou mayest rightly rejoice!" He pronounces HITZIG's and Z.'s rendering of נִהְיָה as untenable lexically, and false to fact.—A.]

Ver. 20. **Walk with wise men and become wise.**—So according to the K'thibh: an infin. abs. [used as an imperative] followed by an imperative instead of a consecutive clause,—which is to be preferred to the K'ri [which is followed by LXX, Vulg., E. V., H., N., S. and M.]. The latter makes the language less spirited and needlessly assimilates it in form to the 2d clause. —**But whosoever delighteth in fools becometh base.**—In the Hebrew there is a play upon words: he who tendeth fools (רֹעֶה) showeth himself base יֵרוֹעַ. [This might be thus imitated in English: he who attendeth fools tendeth to folly]. For this use of the verb רעה, to follow or attach one's self to some one, *sectari aliquem*, to cultivate intercourse with one, comp. xxviii. 7; xxix. 3; Jer. xvii. 16. From this is derived רֵעַ "friend, comrade."

Ver. 21. **To the righteous God repayeth good.**—As subject of the verb we should supply in this instance not the indefinite subject, "one," *man*, but rather Jehovah (unlike the instances in x. 24; xii. 12). HITZIG needlessly substitutes as an emendation יְקַדֵּם, "meeteth," suggested by the καταλήψεται of the LXX. For the meaning comp. x. 25; xi. 3, 5, *etc.*

Ver. 22. **A good man leaveth an inheritance to his children's children.** For this absolute use of the Hiph., "causeth to inherit, transmitteth his estate," comp. Deut. xxxii. 8. For the sentiment comp. Job xxvii. 17; Eccles. ii. 26.

Ver. 23. **The poor man's new land** (yieldeth) **much food.** The noun נִיר according to Hos. x. 12; Jer. iv. 3, describes "newly broken, newly ploughed land," *i. e.* a field newly cleared, and therefore cultivated with much effort (Vulg. correctly *novalia:* LUTHER less exactly "furrows" (*Furchen*). If such a field nevertheless yields its poor possessor "much food," he must be a devout and upright poor man, and so possess the main condition of genuine prosperity, which is wanting to the man mentioned in clause *b*, who is evidently a man of means, a rich man, who in consequence of his iniquity (lit., "by not-justice") is destroyed.—HITZIG on the ground of the phraseology, which is certainly somewhat hard and obscure, pronounces the verse corrupt, and therefore reads נִיב instead of נִיר, and so gets for clause *a* the meaning "A great man who consumes the income of capital" (!). Furthermore he pronounces the whole verse spurious, and thinks it originally formed a marginal comment on xi. 24 (!!) but then by the mistake of some copyist was introduced into the text just at this point. [RUEETSCHI (as above quoted) interprets clause *a* in like manner of the righteous poor man's newly cleared land, which, although wrought with difficulty, abundantly rewards the labor. The יֵשׁ of clause *b* he regards not as a verb "there is," but as a substantive (comp. viii. 21), with the meaning "substance, wealth." This is destroyed where there has been unrighteousness.—A.]

Ver. 24. **He that spareth his rod hateth his son.** See iii. 12; xxiii. 13, 14; xxix. 15; Ecclesiast. xxx. 1.—**But whosoever loveth him seeketh it, correction.** The suffix of the last verb here, as in ver. 22, refers to the object immediately following, and this noun is here used actively in the sense of "chastisement, discipline which one employs with another." Others take the suffix as the indirect object, equivalent to לוֹ, "for him;" he seeketh for him (the son) correction. This, however, is not grammatically admissible. HITZIG maintains that the verb is here to be taken after the analogy of the Arabic in the sense of "tame, subdue," and that the noun is a second accusative object (?),—and that we should therefore translate "he restraineth him by correction." So also HOFMANN, *Schriftbew.* II. 2, 377 (follows him up with correction). With ver. 25 comp. Ps. xxxiv. 10 (11), Prov. x. 3, *etc.*

DOCTRINAL, ETHICAL, HOMILETIC, AND PRACTICAL.

The idea which appears in the very first verse, of salutary discipline, or of education by the word of God and sound doctrine, also reappears afterward several times in a significant way (vers. 13, 14, 18, 24; comp. vers. 6, 10, 20, 21); it therefore to a certain extent controls the whole development of thought throughout this Section, so far as we may speak of anything of the kind. We have also here again as in chap. iv. (see above, p. 74,) a chapter on the true religious

Digitized by Google

training of children. Only it is here specifically training to the wise use of earthly blessings (so in particular the group vers. 4-12), and to the knowledge of God's word as the chief blessing (so especially in the 2d half, vers. 18-25); this is urged by most of the proverbs that are here grouped. Hence the frequent allusions to the blessing of constant diligence, and patient labor in one's earthly calling in reliance upon God (vers. 4, 11, 23, 25); also to the great value of earthly possessions gathered under God's gracious help, as important instrumentalities for the fulfilment of the spiritual duties also involved in one's calling (vers. 8, 11, 12, 18, 22); further to the hateful and harmful nature of pride and vanity (vers. 7 *a*, 10, 16, 18); to the evil consequences of unfaithfulness, since it necessarily "smites its own lord" (vers. 2, 5, 15, 17); to the importance of good company, and of a decided abhorrence of that evil companionship which corrupts the morals (vers. 1, 6, 20; comp. 1 Cor. xv. 33), *etc.*

Therefore, in the *homiletic* treatment of the *chapter as a whole*, we have as a subject "The true Christian education of children." 1) Its basis: God's word (vers. 1, 13, 14); 2) its means: love, and strictness in inculcating God's word (vers. 1, 18, 24); 3) its aim: guidance of the youth to the promotion of his temporal and eternal welfare (vers. 2 sq., 16 sq.) Or, on the right use of God's word as the basis, the means, and the end in all human culture. Or, on the word of God as the most precious of all possessions (comp. Matt. vi. 33; xiii. 44-46; 1 Pet. i. 23-25).—Stöcker:—The wise man's discipline (*Disciplina sapientis*). 1) Wherein it consists (1-10); 2) What qualities the well-trained wise man possesses, viz. chiefly, *a*) Moderation and prudence in the use of earthly good; *b*) Humility and modesty; 3) What is the blessing of a wise training.

Vers. 1–3. Starke:—No one is born pious; every one brings sin with him into the world; therefore from the tenderest childhood upward diligence should be employed with youth that they may grow up "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord" (Eph. vi. 2). There are spirits that from merest infancy onward have their jests at everything that belongs to virtue and piety (Gen. xxi. 9); to improve such always costs much work and prayer.—(On vers. 2, 3): If words spoken heedlessly before a human tribunal are often so dangerous that they can bring one into the greatest misfortune, how can evil words be indifferent in the view of God the Supreme Judge (Matt. xii. 36)?—Wohlfarth:—On what does the happy result of education depend? 1) On the side of parents, on the strictest conscientiousness in the fulfilment of their duties as educators (ver. 1); 2) On the side of children, on their thankful reception of this training (vers. 2-9).

Vers. 4–12. Starke (on ver. 5):—The natural man shuns lying and deceit on account of the outward shame and reproach; the pious abhors them with all his heart for God's sake.—(On ver. 7): A man's condition may not be with certainty inferred from the outward appearance: "all is not gold that glitters" (Eccles. viii. 4; 1 Sam. xvi. 7). The spiritually poor who feels his inward poverty stands in the right relation, in which he can become truly rich in the grace of God.—(On ver. 8): The poor man may have many advantages over the rich, in case he knows how to use his poverty aright.—(On ver. 11): That many men of means become poor is caused by the fact that they do not wisely apply what is theirs, but waste it on all manner of useless things.—(On ver. 12): If thou hast made some promise to thy neighbor, defer not long the fulfilment of the promise. He who gives promptly gives double.—[Bridges (on ver. 5):—It is not that a righteous man never lies. Nor is it a proof of a righteous man that he avoids lying. But true religion brings in the new taste—conformity to the mind of God.—Trapp (on ver. 9):—A saint's joy is as the light of the sun, fed by heavenly influence, and never extinct, but diffused through all parts of the world.—(On ver. 11): Ill-gotten goods fly away without taking leave of the owner.—(On ver. 12): We are short-breathed, short-spirited. But as God seldom comes at our time, so He never fails at His own; and then He is most sweet because most seasonable.—Arnot (on ver. 12):—If the world be made the portion of an immortal spirit, to want it is one sickness, to have it is another. To desire and to possess a perishable portion are only two different kinds of misery to men].—J. Lange (on ver. 12):—Children of God must often hope long under the cross for their deliverance. Yet when this comes at length, it is so refreshing and joyful, that they begin as it were to live anew.—Zeltner (on ver. 12):—Set thy hope not on the vain, uncertain and transient, but on the imperishable and eternal, on God and His word, 1 Cor. iv. 18; 1 Tim. vi. 17.

Vers. 13–17. *Tübingen Bible* (on ver. 13):—It is very great wisdom gladly to receive correction when one has erred; but it is folly to be angry when one is warned against everlasting destruction.—Geier:—Faithful discharge of the duties that devolve on us secures a good conscience and reward from God and men.—[Trapp (on ver. 15):—Natural conscience cannot but do homage to the image of God stamped upon the natures and works of the godly.—Arnot:—It is far-seeing mercy that makes the way of transgressors hard; its hardness warns the traveller to turn that he may live].—Starke (on ver. 16):—If thine act and project are to prosper, begin with prudence and good counsel, and so continue till thou hast done.—Wohlfarth:—Wisdom as the fountain of true life. Its correction like its counsel is health and blessing; its yoke is soft and light, because it urges us to act and to walk simply according to our destination.—Von Gerlach (on vers. 18 sq.):—A despiser of God's word involves himself in its penalties, he falls sooner or later under its chastisement: while on the contrary his reward never fails the righteous.—(On ver. 17): While the wicked messenger prepares misfortune for himself as well as for his master, the faithful makes good even his lord's mistakes.

Vers. 18–25. *Berleburg Bible* (on ver. 18):—Where one finds a spirit that can tolerate no correction, is always excusing and defending itself, or throwing the blame on others, from

Digitized by Google

such a one there is no good to be hoped.—(On ver. 20): It is very profitable to cultivate friendship and familiar intercourse with spiritually-minded men, because one is in general wont easily to take to one's self the spirit of those with whom one associates.—ZELTNER (on ver. 20):—If thou shunnest an infected house, how much more shouldst thou shun the company of the ungodly, that thou mayest not be touched by the poison of their sins and vices.—[ARNOT:—The issue to be decided is not what herd you shall graze with a few years before your spirit return to the dust; but what moral element you shall move in during the few and evil days of life, till your spirit return to God who gave it].—STARKE (on ver. 21):—Sin evermore draws after it God's wrath and judgments as the shadow always closely follows the body.—[T. ADAMS (on ver. 22):—The usurer lightly begets blind children that cannot see to keep what their father left them. But when the father is gone to hell for gathering, the son often follows for scattering. But God is just].—MELANCHTHON (on ver. 23):—It is better to possess small means, but use them well, and enjoy them with pious and contented mind, than to heap up great treasures, that pass not away without offences of many kinds.—OSIANDER (on ver. 23).—God gives to a pious man who is poor nevertheless nourishment enough if he only labor diligently in his calling and forsake not prayer.—J. LANGE (on ver. 24):—A good father follows his children unweariedly with prayer, correction and counsel, that he may not be forced afterwards bitterly to deplore omitting correction at the right time.—VON GERLACH (on ver. 24):—A loving father strives to correct his child early; he does not wait till urgent need forces him to it.—[JOHN HOWE:—Fond parents think it love (that spares the rod); but divine wisdom calls it hatred.—BRIDGES:—The discipline of our children must commence with self-discipline. Nature teaches us to love them much. But we want a controlling principle to teach us to love them wisely. The indulgence of our children has its root in self-indulgence].

δ) With reference to the relation between the wise and the foolish, the rich and the poor, masters and servants.

CHAP. XIV.

1 Woman's wisdom buildeth her house,
but folly teareth it down with its own hands.
2 He that walketh uprightly feareth Jehovah,
but he that is perverse in his ways despiseth him.
3 In the mouth of the foolish is a rod for his pride,
but the lips of the wise preserve them.
4 Where there are no oxen the crib is clean,
but much increase is by the strength of the ox.
5 A faithful witness cannot lie,
but a false witness uttereth lies.
6 The scorner hath sought wisdom, and findeth it not,
but to the man of understanding is knowledge easy.
7 Go from the presence of the foolish man;
thou hast not found (with him) lips of knowledge.
8 The wisdom of the prudent is to understand his way,
the folly of fools is a deception.
9 The sacrifice maketh sport of fools,
but to the righteous there is favor.
10 The heart knoweth its own bitterness,
and let no stranger intermeddle with its joy.
11 The house of the wicked is overthrown,
but the tent of the upright shall flourish.
12 There is a way that seemeth right to man,
but the end thereof is the ways of death.
13 Even in laughter the heart will be (perchance) sad,
and the end of joy is sorrow.
14 He that is of a perverse heart shall be satisfied with his own ways,
but a good man (shall be satisfied) from him (E. V. "from himself").

Digitized by Google

15 The simple believeth every word,
the wise giveth heed to his way.
16 The wise feareth and departeth from evil,
but the fool is presuming and confident.
17 He that is quick to anger worketh folly,
and the man of wicked devices is hated.
18 The simple have secured folly,
but the wise shall embrace knowledge.
19 The wicked bow before the good,
and sinners at the doors of the righteous.
20 The poor is hated even by his neighbor,
but they that love the rich are many.
21 Whosoever despiseth his friend is a sinner,
but he that hath mercy on the poor—blessings on him!
22 Do not they go astray that devise evil?
and are not mercy and faithfulness with them that devise good?
23 In all labor there is profit,
but mere talk (leadeth) only to want.
24 The crown of the wise is their riches,
the folly of fools (is evermore) folly.
25 A true witness delivereth souls,
but he that uttereth lies is a cheat.
26 In the fear of Jehovah is strong security,
and to His children He will be a refuge.
27 The fear of Jehovah is a fountain of life,
to escape the snares of death.
28 In the multitude of the people is the king's honor,
but from want of people (cometh) the downfall of the prince.
29 He that is slow to wrath is great in understanding,
but he that is hasty of spirit exalteth folly.
30 The life of the body is a quiet spirit,
but passion the rottenness of the bones.
31 He that oppresseth the poor hath reproached his Maker,
whosoever honoreth him hath had mercy on the poor.
32 By his wickedness is the wicked driven forth,
but the righteous hath hope (even) in his death.
33 In the heart of a man of understanding doth wisdom rest,
but in the midst of fools it maketh itself known.
34 Righteousness exalteth a nation,
but sin is a reproach to any people.
35 The king's favor is towards a wise servant,
but his wrath against him that is base.

GRAMMATICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1.—Read חָכְמוֹת, as in i. 20; ix. 1, and not חַכְמוֹת (fem. plur. constr.), as though "the wise ones among women" (comp. Jud. v. 29) were to be here designated (so the LXX, Vulg., Luther). [So substantially the E. V., Noyes, *etc.*, distributing the plural on account of the singular of the verb. Fuerst regards חָכְ׳ as merely another form of the abstract noun. Bött. does not admit the possibility of this, but explains the form in the text as an indef. or distributive plural, holding, nevertheless, that the antithesis with אִוֶּלֶת requires here the usual abstract. §§ 700, *c* and n. 4, and 702, *c*, *e*.—A.]

Ver. 2.—The ו in בּוֹזֵהוּ is one of the few examples in the early Hebrew of the Hholem plen. in emphatic verbal forms beginning or ending a clause. See Bött., § 167.—A.]

Ver. 3.—The form תִּשְׁמוּרֵם should probably be changed to תִּשְׁמְרֵם, since the assumption of the lengthening of the vowel (vocal Sheva) in the syllable preceding the accent seems hardly justified by analogies like Ex. xviii. 26; Ruth ii. 8. Comp. Hitzig on this passage. [Bött. defends the form doubtfully, and regards it as probably an illustration of the speech of the common people. The fem. form of the verb is indicated only by the prefix, and not by its ordinary termination. See §§ 367, *b*, 1043, 4 and n. 3, and 1047, *e*. See Green, § 105, *d*.—A.]

Ver. 5.—[יְכַזֵּב, one of Böttcher's examples of the "*Ficus licitum*," what *may* or *can* be; § 950, *c*, *β*; will not—can not.—A.]

Ver. 6.—[בִּקֶּשׁ a "relative" perfect, like חֵרֵף and חוֹנֵן in ver. 31; "hath been seeking .... and it is not," "hath already virtually reproached his Maker," "hath already shown mercy."—Bött., § 950, 1.—A.]

נָקֵל is undoubtedly a neuter participle,—נְקַלָּה, a trifle, a small, easy matter.

Ver. 7.—[Three points come under consideration: 1) the meaning of מִנֶּגֶד לְ, 2) the force of the perfect tense יָדַעְתָּ, and 3) the meaning of the connective וְ. On the first, in addition to the arguments of Z. in the exegetical notes, RUEETSCHI urges (as before cited, p. 140) that with verbs of motion the only natural rendering is "from before," the לְ being justified by Deut. xxviii. 66 as well as the passage in Judges. In regard to the second the simple perfect is easier than a predictive perfect; thou hast not—thou surely wilt not. Z. omits the connective וְ in his version; "and" might be equivalent to "in case, or where thou hast not," *etc.* RUEETSCHI somewhat more unnaturally renders "otherwise;" he obtains the very forcible meaning "otherwise thou hast not known lips of knowledge"—hast not learned their nature, and art now making this evident. DE WETTE agrees with ROSENMUELLER in rendering clause *b* as a relative clause—"and *from him in whom* thou hast not," *etc.*—A.]

Ver. 10.—[יִתְעָרָב ֵ for ַ in final syllable under the influence of the guttural, GREEN, § 119, 1; BÖTT., §§ 378, 1, 1055. In מָרַּת, derived from מָרַר, we have one of the few instances of a doubled ר. See GREEN, § 60, 4, *a*, BÖTTCHER, § 392, 2, *c*.—A.]

Ver. 12.—[דֶּרֶךְ is used in the first clause as masc., in the second as fem. In the historical books, Jerem. and Proverbs, this confusion is common. See BÖTT., §§ 657, 2; 877, *γ. e.*—A.]

Ver. 13.—The suffix in וְאַחֲרִיתָהּ refers to the following שִׂמְחָה, as in the passages cited above in connection with xiii. 4. To divide וְאַחֲרִית הַשִּׂ׳ (J. D. MICHAELIS, HITZIG) is an alteration altogether unnecessary in the case before us, where the expression "joy" in clause *b* is nothing but a repetition of that of "laughter" in clause *a*.

Ver. 14.—To change to וּמִמַּעֲלָלָיו (L. CAPELLUS, JAEGER, *etc.*), or to מִמַּעֲלָיו (ELSTER, comp. EWALD) is plainly needless in view of the simple and obvious interpretation of מֵעָלָיו given in the notes.

[BÖTT. proposes with great confidence to amend clause *b* by substituting for אִישׁ the verb יָמִישׁ; §§ 460, 2, *a*, and 1143, 6; "good will depart from him."—A.]

Ver. 15.—[Observe the emphatic change of accent and vocalization in פֶּתִי.]

Ver. 17.—In view of the explanation which may be given of the text, attempted emendations appear needless and inappropriate, such, *e. g.*, as EWALD's, who proposes instead of יִשָּׂנֵא to read יַשְׁוֶא ("he quiets his anger," "keeps his equanimity"); or that of HITZIG, who to secure the same meaning reads יִשָּׁאֵן, *etc.* [RUEETSCHI emphatically defends the received text.]

Ver. 18.—[Observe the change of tense; נָחֲלוּ, "*Perfectum repentinum*," used of that which is easily and quickly done; יַכְתִּרוּ, "*Fiens licitum*," are disposed or incline i to wait, *etc.* BÖTT., §§ 950, B; 940, 2; 943, *c*, *a*.—A.]

Ver. 25.—[יָפִיחַ, as in vi. 19; xii. 17; xix. 5, 9, an irregular participial form.]

Ver. 28.—רָזוֹן is a collateral form of רוֹזֵן, as עָשׁוֹק of עֹשֵׁק. The expression here stands as a parallel to מֶלֶךְ, as the plural רוֹזְנִים often stands side by side with מְלָכִים.

Ver. 30.—[בְּשָׂרִים, plural, probably, on account of the following עֲצָמוֹת. BÖTT. however (§ 695, 5) explains it as an example of the "*pluralis extensivus*" used also of the entire, the complete, the large,—"the life of the whole body."—A.]

EXEGETICAL.

1. Vers. 1-7. On wisdom and folly in general. —**Woman's wisdom buildeth her house.** [See critical notes]. It is plain that in contrast with this wisdom of the godly we are to understand by "folly" in clause *b* especially woman's folly.—With ver. 2, *a*. compare x. 9; with *b*, ii. 15; iii. 32.—Ver. 3. **In the fool's mouth is a rod for his pride,**—lit., "a rod of pride." [Is this genitive subjective or objective? a rod which his pride uses, for himself, or others, or both, as it has been variously understood,—or a rod by which his pride is itself chastised? The antithesis commends the latter, which is the view of BERTHEAU, KAMPH., *etc.*, as well as Z. According to S., "pride" is the subject and not a limiting genitive—A.] HITZIG unnecessarily proposes to understand גַּאֲוָה in the sense of גֵּו "back," a meaning which even in Job xli. 7 hardly belongs to the word [although given by AQUILA, JEROME, *etc.*] (Comp. DELITZSCH on the passage.)—**But the lips of the wise preserve them.**—For the construction comp. xi. 6; xii. 6, *etc.;* for the meaning, x. 13, 14.—Ver. 4. **Where there are no oxen the crib remaineth empty.**—אֵבוּס, "crib," not "stall" (UMBREIT); בַּר, in itself meaning "pure, clean," is here "empty;" so sometimes נָקִי. The drift of the proverb is not quite the same as in x. 15; xiii. 8 (a commendation of moderate wealth as a means of doing good and as a preservative from spiritual want). Rather is this the probable meaning: "He who will develop his wealth to a gratifying abundance must employ the appropriate means; for "nothing costs nothing, but brings nothing in" (ELSTER, HITZIG).—With ver. 5 comp. xii. 17; with *b* in particular vi. 19.—Ver. 6. **The scorner hath sought wisdom, and findeth it not,**—lit., "and it is not," comp. xiii. 7. The bearing of this proverb is plainly directed against that superficial, trivial, seeming culture of the scoffers at religion, (who, in the perverted sense of the word, are "the enlightened"), which lacks all genuine earnestness, and for that very reason all really deep knowledge and discernment.—**But to the man of understanding is knowledge given.**—See critical notes.

Ver. 7. **Go from the presence of the foolish man.**—So LUTHER had already correctly rendered; also DE WETTE, BERTHEAU, ELSTER; for מִנֶּגֶד [from the front, from before] does not describe motion directly toward or at one (EWALD, comp. UMBREIT), but remoteness from him, as Is. i. 16; Am. ix. 8; and for the connection with לְ which, it is true, is unusual, comp. Judges xx. 34. [See critical notes].—HITZIG, following the LXX and Syr. vers., writes the first word of the

Digitized by Google

verse כֹּל instead of לְךָ, and in clause *b* reads כְּלִי־דַעַת instead of בַּל־יָדַעְתָּ, from which the meaning is obtained "The foolish man hath every thing before him, but lips of knowledge are a receptacle of understanding" (LXX: *ὅπλα δὲ αἰσθήσεως*). But the idea of the second clause experiences in this way no possible improvement, but only an injury (observe the tautological character of the expressions "lips of knowledge" and "receptacle or vessel of knowledge"), and for this reason we should retain the meaning given above for the first clause also.—In clause *b* the verb is a proper perfect, "thou hast not known or recognized lips of knowledge," this is, if thou soughtest any such thing in him. [W. is wrong in rendering "over against," and "wilt not know."—A.]

2. Vers. 8–19. Further delineation of the wise and the foolish, especially with reference to their contrasted lot in life.—**The wisdom of the wise is to understand his way,**—lit., "observe his way." For this use of the verb with the accusative, in the sense of to "observe or consider something," comp. chap. vii. 7; Ps. v. 2. For the sentiment of the verse comp. xiii. 16, and ver. 15 below.—**The folly of fools is deception.**—"Deceit" here in the sense of self-deception, imposition on self, blindness, which is at last followed by a fearful self-sobering, a coming to a consciousness of the real state of the case (comp. Ps. vii. 15; Job xv. 35).

Ver. 9. **The sacrifice maketh sport of fools,**—*i. e.*, the expiatory sacrifice which ungodly fools offer to God is utterly useless, fails of its object, inasmuch as it does not gain the favor of God, which is, on the contrary, to be found only among the upright (lit., "between upright men," *i. e.*, in the fellowship of the upright or honorable, comp. Luke ii. 14). Thus Bertheau, Ewald, Elster [Stuart and Wordsworth], *etc.*, while the majority, disregarding the singular member in the verb, translate "Fools make a mock at sin" [E. V., M., N., H.] ("make sport with sin," Umbreit, comp. Luther). [Hodgson, rightly conceiving the grammatical relation, but making both subject and object concrete, renders "sinners mock at fools"]. Hitzig here again proposes violent emendations, and obtains the meaning "The tents (?) of the foolish are overthrown (??) in punishment; the house (?) of the upright is well pleasing."

Ver. 10. **The heart knoweth its own bitterness,**—lit., "a heart knoweth the trouble of its soul," *i. e.*, what one lacks one always knows best one's self; therefore the interference of strangers will always be somewhat disturbing. If this be so, then it follows that it is also not advisable "to meddle with one's joy," and this is the point that is urged in clause *b*. A precept applicable unconditionally to all cases is of course not designed here. The author of our proverbs will hardly be put in antagonism to what the Apostle enjoins in Rom. xii. 15. It is rather a hard and intrusive manifestation of sympathy in the joy and sorrow of one's neighbor, that is to be forbidden.—With 11, *a*, comp. xii. 7; Job xviii. 15; with *b*, Is. xxvii. 6.—With ver. 12, *a*, comp. xii. 15; xvi. 2.—**But the end thereof are ways of death,**—*i. e.*, the way of vice, which at the beginning appears straight (the way is not directly described as the way of vice, yet is plainly enough indicated as such), at length merges itself wholly in paths that lead down to mortal ruin; comp. ver. 4; vii. 27.—The same verse appears again below in xvi. 25. Ver. 13. **Even in laughter the heart will be** (perchance) **sad.**—The Imperf. of the verb here expresses a possible case, something that may easily and often occur. The contrasted condition is suggested by Eccles. vii. 4: "Though the face be sad, the heart may yet be glad." [Notwithstanding Holden's observation, that "though sorrow may be occasioned *by* laughter, it does not exist *in* it," it is a deeper truth, that in circumstances producing a superficial joyousness, there is often an underlying, profounder sorrow.—A.]—**And the end of joy is sorrow** [not by a mere emotional reaction, but] in such a case as this; the heart, which under all apparent laughter is still sad, feels and already anticipates the evil that will soon have wholly transformed the gladness into grief.

Ver. 14. **He that is of a perverse heart shall be satisfied with his own ways,** *i. e.*, he who has departed from God (lit., "he that is turned aside in heart," comp. Ps. xliv. 19) is surfeited with his own ways, partakes of the ruinous results of his sinful action; comp. xii. 14; xiii. 2; xxviii. 19.—**But a good man (shall be satisfied) from him,** *i. e.*, the good man solaces himself in the contemplation of the wicked and his fate (chap. xxix. 16; Job xxii. 19; Ps. xxxvii. 34; lviii. 11); or, it may be, the upright man enters into the possession of the good which the other loses (comp. xi. 8, 29; xiii. 22). מֵעָלָיו, strictly "from with him," expresses here this idea,—"from that which belongs to him as its foundation" (Hitzig), and therefore "from his experience, from the sorrowful occurrences of life in which he is deservedly involved." [E. V., H., N., M. render reflexively "from himself," and make the experiences parallel; each shall be satisfied "with his own ways," or "from himself." The third pers. suffix has this reflexive meaning after מֵעַל distinctly in 1 Sam. xvii. 22, 39; Jonah iii. 6. The suffix in clause *a* is reflexive, "his own ways," and we must regard the same construction as the simplest and most natural in *b*—A.]

Ver. 15. **The simple believeth every word,**—Elster: "every thing." But as objects of belief, it is, in the first instance and most directly, words alone that come under consideration, and reference is made here precisely to the unreliableness of *words* as used by men, as in chap. vi. 1 sq.; x. 19; Eccles. v. 1 sq.; Ps. cxvi. 11, *etc.*—With clause *b* compare above ver. 8 *a*.—Ver. 16. With clause *a* compare xvi. 6, 17.—**The fool is presuming and confident.**—Comp. xxi. 24; xxviii. 16. The latter of these descriptive terms unquestionably describes a false security, and carnal arrogance, which is the opposite of the fear of God. The former epithet means "self-exalting, bearing one's self insolently," or it may be (like the Kal conj. of the same verb in chap. xxii. 3) "boldly rushing on,

Digitized by Google

overriding" (HITZIG, comp. LUTHER, "rushes wildly through").

Ver. 17. **He that is quick to anger worketh folly.**— Strictly, "he who foams up quickly, who flies into a passion," contrasted with the man who is "slow to anger," ver. 29. [אַפַּיִם, the nostrils, then the breathing, which by its quietness or its excitement, marks the state of the temper].—**And the man of wicked devices is hated.**—Literally, "the man of shrewd reflections, well contrived counsels" (comp. remarks on i. 4, and also chap. xii. 2; xxiv. 8; Ps. xxxvii. 7), who is not here set as a contrast, but as a counterpart to the passionate man; the crafty and subtle man, who, in spite of all his show of mildness, is still as thoroughly hated as the irascible and passionate man. The relation of the two clauses is accordingly not antithetic, but that of a logical parallel. With one manifestation of an evil disposition another is immediately associated, with a suggestion of the results which are in accordance with it; comp. chap. x. 10, 18.

Ver. 18. **But the wise shall embrace knowledge.**—יַכְתִּירוּ (comp. Ps. cxlii. 8), literally, "surround, enclose," cannot here mean "they crown themselves, or are crowned" [the verb is not reflexive] (UMBREIT, comp. LUTHER [DE W., E. V., H., N., S., M., W.]), but, as the parallel verb in clause *a* indicates, must convey simply the meaning of "laying hold upon," *i. e.*, gathering, accumulating [so FUERST, BERTHEAU, KAMPH., *etc.*].

Ver. 19. **And the wicked at the doors of the righteous,**—*i. e.*, they bow there (the verb is to be repeated from the first clause). The figure lying at the basis of this representation is that of the ambassadors of a conquered people, who, kneeling at the doors of their conqueror's palace, await his command. For the general sentiment comp. xiii. 9, 22; also Psalm xxxvii. 25, *etc.*

3. Vers. 20-27. On riches and poverty in their causal connection with wisdom and folly.—**The poor is hated even by his neighbor.**—Comp. xix. 4; Ecclesiast. vi. 7 sq.; xii. 8 sq. Numerous parallels from classic authors (*e. g.*, THEOGNIS, V. 621, 697; OVID, *Trist.*, I., 9, 5, 6), and also from Rabbinical and Arabic authors, may be found in UMBREIT's Commentary *in loco*. "Is hated," *i. e.*, "is repelled as disagreeable, is obnoxious" (comp. Deut. xx. 15; Mal. i. 3). How this may come to pass, how former friendship between two persons may be transformed into its opposite on account of the impoverishment of one of them, is impressively illustrated by our Lord's parable of the neighbor whom a friend asks for three loaves (comp. Luke xi. 5-8.)—Ver. 21. **Whosoever despiseth his friend is a sinner,** *i. e.*, he who neglects a friend that has fallen into destitution (comp. ver. 20 *a*), who does not render him assistance, sins just as surely as his act is praiseworthy who is compassionate to the poor or wretched (read עֲנָיִים with the K'thibh). With the benediction in clause *b* compare xvii. 20.

Ver. 22. **Do they not err that devise evil?**—The figurative expression "carve evil" (comp. iii. 29; vi. 14) has as its counterpart in the second clause the kindred figure "carve out good," *i. e.*, contrive or devise good (*bona machinari*). Instead of יִתְעוּ "they err, or go astray" (comp. Job xv. 31) HITZIG reads יֵרֵעוּ (from רעע): "Ought it not to go ill with them that devise evil?" But the language of the text characterizes with sufficient strength and clearness the unsettled and disastrous condition of those who have departed from God's ways.—**And are not mercy and truth with those that devise good?**—The interrogative particle affects the second clause as well as the first (so UMBREIT, and doubtless correctly, in opposition to most modern interpreters [*e. g.*, E. V., DE W., BERTHEAU. H., M., S., K., while NOYES agrees with our author]). The construction is like that in xiii. 18.—"Mercy and truth" are probably God's manifestations of Himself toward them, as in Gen. xxxii. 11; Ps. lxi. 7, and not human attributes, as above in chap. iii. 3 (see note *in loco*), or as in xvi. 6; xx. 28. [So TRAPP and others, while M. and S. make them human,—M. making these the *experience*, and S. the *action* of those who devise good.—A.]

Ver. 23. **In all labor there is profit, but idle talk** (leadeth) **only to want.**—(Comp. xi. 24; xxi. 5); in the latter passage "profit" and "want" are contrasted precisely as here.—"Idle talk;" in the Hebrew literally, "word of the lips;" comp. Isa. xxxvi. 5; Job xi. 2; xv. 3. The sentiment of the entire verse is moreover plain: "One should beware of idle talk more than of the hardest toil" (BERTHEAU). Comp. Matt. xii. 36.

Ver. 24. **The crown of the wise is their riches,** *i. e.* the well-earned possessions of the wise become his honor, are a real adornment to him, for which he is with good reason praised. "The folly of fools, on the other hand, is and continues folly," though he may ever so much parade and swell with it, though he may in particular studiously employ any riches he may chance to possess in splendidly decorating himself, and giving himself a magnificent appearance by all manner of outward trifles and finery (comp. BERTHEAU, UMBREIT, ELSTER on this passage). [TRAPP: "Why, was it not foolishness before they were rich? Yes, but now it is become egregious foolishness"].— HITZIG has here again needlessly felt constrained to amend. He reads in clause *a* "their prudence," עָרְמָם, and in clause *b*, as the subject, "ostentation," אולַת instead of אִוֶּלֶת; so he obtains the meaning, "The crown of the wise is their prudence (?); the pomp of fools is—drunken (??)."

Ver. 25. **A true witness delivereth souls,** *i. e.* from the death involved in some false charge brought against them before the court, and which therefore threatens them in case a truthful witness does not clear them and bring their innocence to light.—**But he that uttereth lies** (comp. ver. 5; vi. 19) **is a cheat.**—Compare xii. 17, where, however, "deceit" מִרְמָה is object of the preceding verb "showeth forth," and not predicate. Here the abstract "deception" stands emphatically for the concrete, "a deceitful man, one without substance or reliableness;" comp. above ver. 8, *b*. [RUEETSCHI (as above,

Digitized by Google

p. 142) would simplify the construction by retaining כַּצִּיל as the common predicate of both clauses, and would give to the second object the meaning "wrongful or unrighteous possession," citing as a parallel Jer. v. 27. We cannot commend the suggestion.—A.] HITZIG instead of "deceit" (מִרְמָה) reads מְרַמֶּה "he destroyeth" (*i. e.* souls), in order to obtain as exact an antithesis as possible to the "delivereth" in the first clause.

Ver. 26. **In the fear of Jehovah is strong security**, or, the fear of Jehovah is strong security, is a sure reliance; for the preposition may properly stand before the subject as the ב *essentiæ*, as in Isa. xxvi. 4; lvii. 6 (so HITZIG).—**And to His children He will be a refuge.**—"To His children," *i. e.* doubtless to His worshippers, those faithful to Him, who for that very reason are His favorites and objects of His care (comp. Deut. xiv. 1). This reference of the suffix to Jehovah Himself is unquestionably more natural than to refer it to the pious, an idea which must first be very artificially extracted from the "fear of Jehovah" (contrary to the view of UMBREIT, EWALD, BERTHEAU, ELSTER, [H., N., M., S.]). HITZIG reads לְבֹנָיו "to its builders," *i. e.* to them who seek to build up that strong fortress, that "security" of the fear of Jehovah (?). With ver. 27 comp. xiii. 14. [RUEETSCHI (as above, p. 142) supports the idea rejected by ZÖCKLER, that the divine protection extends to the children and the children's children of such as honor God. Although not without grammatical warrant for the construction, and conveying beautifully a precious scriptural truth, we must regard the rendering as here somewhat forced.—A.]

4. Vers. 28–35. Continued parallels between the wise and the foolish, the rich and the poor—with the addition of the closely related comparison of masters and servants.—**From want of people** (cometh) **the downfall of the prince.** "People" (לְאֹם) as in xi. 26. Whether in the choice of the word rendered "prince" there is a hidden allusion to the ordinary meaning, "consumption" (HITZIG, comp. UMBREIT) must remain in doubt. For this use of מְחִתָּה, downfall, ruin, comp. x. 14; xiii. 3.

Ver. 29. **He that is slow to anger is great in understanding.**—Literally, he that is long or slow in anger, βραδὺς εἰς ὀργήν, James i. 19; therefore, the forbearing, the patient. "Great, *i. e.* rich in understanding" (comp. "great in acts," 2 Sam. xxiii. 20); comp. the Latin *multus prudentia.*—**But he that is hasty in spirit** (quick-tempered) **exalteth folly**, *i. e.* makes much of it, carries it to excess. Thus HITZIG, and doubtless correctly, while the majority take the verb in the sense of "to exalt before the view of men," *manifestare, declarare*, for which idea however the parallel passages xii. 23; xiii. 16 are by no means conclusive [H., S., M., W. all take this view].

Ver. 30. **The life of the body is a quiet spirit.**—Lit., "life of the members (see Critical Notes) is a heart of quietness" (מַרְפֵּא not meaning here "health," but composure, a tranquil condition, as in xv. 4; Eccles. x. 4).—**But passion the rottenness of the bones.**—Comp. xii. 4, and for this use of קִנְאָה, "passionate zeal," violent excitement in general (not specifically envy or jealousy) Job v. 2.—Ver. 31. With clause *a* compare xvii. 5, with *b*, xix. 17 *a*, and above ver. 21.

Ver. 32. **By his wickedness is the wicked driven forth**, driven forth, *i. e.* from life; he is by a violent death swept away from this earthly life (comp. Ps. xxxvi. 12; lxii. 3).—**But the righteous hath hope** (even) **in his death.** He "is confident," viz. in Jehovah; comp. Ps. xvii. 7, where the same absolute use of the participle "trusting" occurs (the "trustful" in general, believers). As in chap. xi. 7, and if possible even more distinctly than in that passage, we have expressed here a hope in the continuance of the individual life after death, and a just retribution in the future world. HITZIG, to avoid this admission, reads in accordance with the LXX (ἐν τῇ ἑαυτοῦ ὁσιότητι) בְּתֻמּוֹ, in his uprightness, "but in his innocence doth the righteous trust." But may not this divergent reading of the LXX owe its origin to the endeavor to gain an antithesis as exact as possible to the "in his wickedness" of the first clause? [RUEETSCHI (as last cited) preserves the recognition of a hope of immortality and also the poetical parallelism, by giving to the word "evil," רָעָה, a physical rather than an ethical meaning: "in his misfortune (or adversity) the wicked is overthrown, but the righteous has confidence even in his death." For the wicked all hope is gone. This seems to us a happy reconciliation of the grammatical and spiritual demands of the two parts of the verse.—A.]

Ver. 33. **In the heart of a man of understanding doth wisdom rest**, *i. e.* quietly, silently; comp. x. 14; xii. 16, 23, and for this use of the verb 1 Sam. xxv. 9.—**But in the midst of fools it maketh itself known**, *i. e.* not "fools draw out the wisdom of the wise," which is naturally quiet, in opposition to them and their folly (HITZIG), but, fools carry their wisdom, which is, however, in fact, only folly, always upon their tongues, and seek most assiduously to make it known (comp. xii. 23; xiii. 16; xv. 2). The expression is pointed and ironical, and yet not for that reason unintelligible, especially after expressions like those in vers. 8, 16, 24, *etc.* It is therefore unnecessary with the Chaldee version to supply the noun "folly" again with the verb.

Ver. 34. **Righteousness exalteth a nation.** Righteousness, צְדָקָה, is here used with a very comprehensive import, of religious and moral rectitude in every relation and direction, and is therefore not to be restricted, as it is by many recent commentators (UMBREIT, HITZIG, *etc.*), to the idea of virtue. Just as little is the idea of "exalting" to be identified with the idea of "honoring" (as ELSTER, HITZIG, *etc.*, would have it); it is rather a general elevation and advancement of the condition of the people that is to be indicated by the term; comp. above, ver. 29.—**But sin is a reproach to the people.**—For the Aramaic term חֶסֶד, "shame," comp.

Digitized by Google

xxviii. 22 (also xxv. 10), and Job vi. 14. And yet in this national reproach and disgrace there is to be included the corresponding injury and misery of other kinds, so that in this view there is a certain justification for the Vulgate's rendering, "*miseros facit*" (which however rests upon the different reading וְחֹסֶר; comp. the LXX and the Syr. vers.), and for LUTHER's "*Verderderben*," destruction.

Ver. 35. With clause *a* comp. xvi. 12.—**But his wrath will find out the base,**—lit., "his wrath will the base be;" comp., *e. g.*, xi. 1, where "his abomination" means the object of his abhorrence. To supply the preposition "to," לְ, from clause *a*, is therefore needless (in opposition to the view of UMBREIT, BERTHEAU).

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

The representation of the entire chapter is plainly shaped by the contrast between the wise and the foolish, and it is only toward the end (vers. 20 sq.) that the kindred contrast between the rich and the poor, and at the very last (vers. 27 sq.) that between rulers and servants, is added.—Ethical truths to which a significant prominence is given, are contained especially in the following proverbs:

Ver. 1. The building of the house by the wisdom of woman. "Only the characteristic wisdom of *woman* (not that of the man) is able to 'build itself a house,' *i. e.*, to make possible a household in the true sense of the word; for the woman alone has the capacity circumspectly to look through the multitude of individual household wants, and carefully to satisfy them; and also because the various activities of the members of the family can be combined in a harmonious unity only by the influence, partly regulative and partly fostering, of a feminine character, gently but steadily efficient. But where there is wanting to the mistress of the house this wisdom attainable only by her and appropriate to her, then that is irrecoverably lost which first binds in a moral fellowship those connected by relationship of blood—that which makes the house from a mere place of abode to become the spiritual nursery of individuals organically associated." (ELSTER).

Ver. 6. The impossibility of uniting a frivolous disposition and jests at religion with true wisdom and understanding. "It is not by a one-sided action of the thinking power, but only by undivided consecration of the whole nature to God, which therefore involves above all other things a right relation of the spiritual nature to Him, that true knowledge in Divine things can be attained. The wise man, however, who has found the true beginning of wisdom, in bowing his inmost will before the Divine, not as something to be mastered by the understanding, but as something to be simply sought as a grace by the renunciation of the very self,—he can easily on this ground which God's own power makes productive, attain a rich development of the understanding." (ELSTER.)

Ver. 10. The disturbing influence of an uninvited interference in the sorrow and the joy of one's neighbor. "Every one has his own circle of sorrows and joys, which his neighbor must leave to him as a quiet sanctuary for himself. For in the liveliest sympathy of which one may ever be conscious, it will still often be altogether impossible to enter into the peculiarity of others' sensibility with such a participation as is really beneficent. Therefore a Turkish proverb (in VON HAMMER, *Morgenl. Kleebl.*, p. 68) also says 'Eat thine own grief and trouble not thyself for another's'" (UMBREIT).—Comp. above, our exegetical notes on this passage.

Ver. 12. The self-deception of many men in regard to their courses, imagined to be healthful, but in reality leading to eternal ruin. Comp. MELANCHTHON: "The admonition relates to the mistiness and weakness of man's judgment, and his many and great errors in counsel, for it is manifest that men often err in judging and in their deliberations. Now they are deceived either by their own imaginations, or by the example of others, or by habit, *etc.*, and being deceived, they rush on all the more fascinated by the devil, as is written of Judas in John xiii. 27."

Ver. 14. The fool ever accumulating nothing but folly, and the wise man gaining in knowledge. Like ver. 24 this proverb is especially instructive with respect to the deep inner connection that exists on the one hand between foolish notions, and a poor, unattractive, powerless earthly position, destitute of all influence,—and on the other hand between true wisdom and large ability in the department both of the material and the spiritual. VON GERLACH pointedly says, "There is a certain power of attraction, according as a man is wise or foolish; the possessions also which the one or the other attains, are in accordance with his disposition."

Ver. 28. A sentiment directed against feeble princes who nevertheless array themselves with disproportionate splendor; and this, as also ver. 34, is designed to call attention to the principle, that it is not external and seeming advantages, but simply and solely the inward competence and moral excellence, whether of the head or of the members of a commonwealth, that are the conditions of its temporal welfare.

Ver. 31. Compassion to the poor is true service of God; comp. James i. 27. Since God has created both rich and poor (1 Sam. ii. 7), since He designs that they shall exist side by side and intermixed (Prov. xxii. 2), since the poor and lowly man is in like manner a being created in His image (James iii. 9), therefore he who deals heartlessly and violently with the poor insults that Being Himself who is the Maker and Ruler of all. The compassionate, on the contrary, discerns and honors His disposition toward His creatures, and the love which he manifests toward them, even the humblest and most unworthy, is in fact manifested toward God Himself; comp. Matth. xxv. 40.—Ver. 32. The confidence which the righteous man possesses even in his death. Compare the exegetical explanation of the passage.

HOMILETIC AND PRACTICAL.

Homily on the entire chapter: The wisdom and folly of men considered in their respective foundations, natures and results; and 1) within

Digitized by Google

the sphere of *domestic* life (vers. 1-7); 2) within that of *civil* life (vers. 8-25); 3) within that of *political* or national life (vers. 26-35).—STÖCKER: Of human wisdom as the fruit of a right culture,—and 1) of the wisdom of *domestic* life (*prudentia œconomica*, vers. 1-25); 2) of the wisdom of public life (*prudentia politica*, vers. 26-35). STARKE: The results of piety and ungodliness 1) in the household, and in social life generally (1-25); 2) in the relations of rulers in particular (26-35).

Vers. 1-7. *Berleburg Bible*:—That wise women build their house, is to be understood not so much of the edifice consisting of wood, stone, plaster, as rather of the family and the household economy, which a wise woman always strives to keep in good condition and to improve. Ps. cxxvii. 1.—*Tübingen Bible* (on vers. 3): He who is wise keepeth his mouth and still more his heart, that he may not in connection with outward consideration and high dignities fall into pride.—(On ver. 4): He that doth not work also shall not eat; the poverty of many springs from this, that they lack industry and diligence.—STARKE (on ver. 6): He who in seeking wisdom has for his end pride and ambition, will never attain true wisdom, unless he changes his views.—(On ver. 7): Evil one always learns more quickly and easily than good; therefore avoid evil company.—[A. FULLER (on ver. 6): If our inquiries be influenced by a spirit of pride and self-sufficiency, we shall stumble at every thing we meet with; but he who knows his own weakness and conducts his inquiries with humility, shall find knowledge easy of attainment.—ARNOT: Those who reject the Bible want the first qualification of a philosopher, a humble and teachable spirit. The problem for man is not to reject all masters, but to accept the rightful One. Submission absolute to the living God, as revealed in the Mediator, is at once the best liberty that could be, and the only liberty that is.—TRAPP (on ver. 6): He that would have heavenly knowledge must first quit his heart of corrupt affections and high conceits.]

Vers. 8–17. *Tübingen Bible* (on ver. 8):—Steady watchfulness and attention to one's self is a great wisdom.—(On ver. 9): To make sport of sin is the height of wickedness.—STARKE (on ver. 10): He who knoweth the heart alone knoweth the needs of thy heart, which no other besides doth know. He can likewise give thee joy where no other can create it for thee.—(On ver. 16): Reverence and love to God must be with us the strongest motive to avoid sin.—(On ver. 17): Between the hasty trespasses of passionate natures, and the deliberate wickedness of malicious man, there is always a great distinction to be made.—VON GERLACH (on ver. 10): How hard it is to console and soothe others, Job's answers to the discourses of his friends are a signal illustration.—(On ver. 12): In connection with the deceptive, seductive show made by impiety, it is important to give more careful heed to one's way in life.—(On ver. 17): A man who quickly falls into a passion does indeed commit a folly, but yet is far preferable to the coldly and selfishly calculating villain. One may well be indignant at the first—the last makes himself odious.—[LORD BACON (*Advancement of Learning*, Book VIII.), on vers. 8 and 15: He who applies himself to the true wisdom takes heed of his own ways, foreseeing dangers, preparing remedies, employing the assistance of the good, guarding himself against the wicked, cautious in entering upon a work, not unprepared for a retreat, watchful to seize opportunities, strenuous to remove impediments, and attending to many other things which concern the government of his own actions and proceedings. But the other kind of wisdom is entirely made up of deceits and cunning tricks, laying all its hope in the circumventing of others, and moulding them to its pleasure; which kind the proverb denounces as being not only dishonest, but also foolish, *etc.*—T. ADAMS (on ver. 9): Mocking is the medium or connection that brings together the fool and sin; thus he makes himself merry; they meet in mockery. Through many degrees men climb to that height of impiety. This is an extreme progress, and almost the journey's end of wickedness.—ARNOT (on ver. 10): The solitude of a human being in either extremity of the experiences of the human heart is sublime and solemnizing. Whether you are glad or grieved, you must be alone.—(On ver. 12): The result accords not with the false opinion, but with the absolute truth of the case. There is a way which is right, whatever it may seem to the world, and the end thereof is life. God's way of coming to us in mercy is also our way of coming to Him in peace.—(On ver. 15): Trust is a lovely thing; but it cannot stand unless it get truth to lean upon.—JOHN HOWE (on ver. 14): The good man is not the first fountain of happiness to himself, but a subordinate one a good man is, and so is satisfied from himself—a fountain fed from a higher fountain—by derivation from Him who is all in all, and more intimate to us than we ourselves. But the wicked man is the prime and first fountain of all misery to himself.—FLAVEL: The upright is satisfied from himself, that is, from his own conscience, which, though it be not the original spring, yet is the conduit at which he drinks peace, joy and encouragement.—R. SOUTH (on ver. 18): 30th of Posthumous Sermons].

Ver. 18–25. ZELTNER (on ver. 19): Bear patiently the pride of the ungodly; it lasts not long.—STARKE (on vers. 20, 21): The many promises that God will graciously reward kindness to the poor must make the Christian joyous and willing in labors of love.—(On ver. 22): Virtue and piety reward those who cherish them, but vices and sins cause nothing but pain and trouble.—GEIER (on ver. 23): Prating and boastful men are like an empty vessel; if one strike it, it does indeed give forth a sound, but for all that nothing goes in.—(On ver. 25): Be intent upon truth in thy words, gestures, acts, and in thy whole walk.

Vers. 26–35. STARKE (on ver. 28): It is the duty of the lords of the land to see to it that their land be well cultivated, and in particular that "mercy and truth dwell in the land, righteousness and peace kiss each other" (Ps. lxxxv. 11).—(On ver. 29): Impatience opposes the will of God, and is therefore the greatest folly.—(On ver. 30): Passion and wrath shorten the life, and care makes old before one's time.—(On ver. 31): Despise no man, be he ever so humble, for thou

Digitized by Google

knowest not but in that act thou art despising a true child of God.—(On ver. 32): There is surely a future life to be hoped for after death; otherwise how could the righteous be so comforted in their death?—(On ver. 34): Sin is the cause of all misery under the sun.—(On ver. 35): If the fidelity of his subjects is pleasing to a king, how much more will God take pleasure if one serves Him faithfully and with the whole heart, through the strength of Jesus Christ!—[ARNOT (on ver. 25): The safety provided for God's children is confidence in Himself, the strong tower into which the righteous run.—(On ver. 31): The necessary dependence of human duty upon Divine faith.—S. DAVIES (on ver. 32): 1) Every righteous man has a substantial reason to hope, whether he clearly see it or not; 2) Good men in common do in fact enjoy a comfortable hope; 3) The hope which the righteous hath shall be accomplished.—SAURIN (on ver. 34): As there is nothing in religion to counteract the design of a wise system of civil polity, so there is nothing in a wise system of civil government to counteract the design of the Christian religion. The exaltation of the nation is the end of civil polity. Righteousness is the end of religion, or rather is religion itself.—EMMONS (on ver. 34): It is the nature of sin 1) to lessen and diminish a people; 2) to sink and depress the spirit of a people; 3) to destroy the wealth of a people; 4) to deprive them of the blessings of freedom; 5) to provoke the displeasure of God and draw down His judgments.]

ε) With reference to various other relations and callings in life, especially within the sphere of the religious life.

CHAP. XV.

1 A soft answer turneth away wrath,
but a bitter word stirreth up anger.
2 The tongue of the wise maketh knowledge attractive,
but the mouth of fools poureth forth folly.
3 The eyes of Jehovah are in every place,
beholding the wicked and the good.
4 A mild tongue is a tree of life,
but transgression therewith is a wound in the spirit.
5 The fool despiseth his father's correction,
but he that regardeth reproof is wise.
6 In the house of the righteous is a great treasure,
but in the gain of the wicked is trouble.
7 The lips of the wise spread knowledge,
but the heart of fools (doeth) not so.
8 The sacrifice of the wicked is abomination to Jehovah,
but the prayer of the upright is his delight.
9 An abomination to Jehovah is the way of the wicked,
but he loveth him that searcheth after righteousness.
10 There is sharp correction for him that forsaketh the way;
he that hateth reproof must die.
11 Hell and the world of the dead are before Jehovah,
how much more the hearts of the sons of men?
12 The scorner liketh not that one reprove him;
to wise men will he not go.
13 A joyous heart maketh a cheerful countenance,
but in sorrow of the heart the spirit is stricken.
14 An understanding heart seeketh after knowledge,
but the face of fools feedeth on folly.
15 All the days of the afflicted are evil,
but he that is of a joyful heart—a perpetual feast.
16 Better is little with the fear of Jehovah
than great treasure and trouble with it.

Digitized by Google

17 Better is a dish of herbs, when love is there,
than a fatted ox and hatred with it.
18 A passionate man stirreth up strife,
but he that is slow to anger allayeth contention.
19 The way of the slothful is as a hedge of thorns,
but the path of the righteous is a highway.
20 A wise son maketh a glad father,
but a foolish man despiseth his mother.
21 Folly is joy to him that lacketh wisdom.
but the man of understanding goeth straight forward.
22 Failure of plans (cometh) where there is no counsel,
but by a multitude of counsellors they come to pass.
23 A man hath joy through the answer of his mouth,
and a word in due season, how good is it!
24 An upward path of life is the way of the wise
to depart from hell beneath.
25 The house of the proud will Jehovah destroy,
and he will establish the border of the widow.
26 An abomination to Jehovah are evil devices,
but pure (in his sight) are gracious words.
27 He troubleth his own house that seeketh unjust gain,
but he that hateth gifts shall live.
28 The heart of the righteous studieth to answer,
the mouth of the wicked poureth forth evil.
29 Jehovah is far from the wicked,
but the prayer of the righteous he heareth.
30 A friendly look rejoiceth the heart,
good tidings make the bones fat.
31 The ear that heareth the reproof of life
will abide among the wise.
32 He that refuseth correction despiseth himself,
but he that heedeth reproof getteth understanding.
33 The fear of Jehovah is a training to wisdom,
and before honor is humility.

GRAMMATICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1.—[דְּבַר־עֶצֶב undoubtedly means wrathful words, bitter words; Ges. reaches this through a subjective meaning of עֶצֶב, labor, pain to the wrathful spirit; Fuerst takes the objective, cutting words, that cause pain to their victim; the latter retains most of the radical meaning of the verb.—A.]

Ver. 2.—[תֵּיטִיב, lit., maketh knowledge good; but the radical idea of the Heb. טוֹב is that which is good to the sense, especially sight; therefore bright, brilliant,—and afterward, that which is agreeable to other senses, hearing, taste, *etc.* The etymological meaning here best suits the sense "make knowledge appear attractive."—A.]

Ver. 5.—[Bött. (§ 1055, III.), commenting on the three passages where the defective form יַעְרִם occurs, proposes as the probable reading יַעֲרִם.—A.]

Ver. 6.—נֶעְכָּרֶת (from עָכַר, chap. xi. 29) is a neuter partic. used substantively in the sense of ruin, destruction; comp. in Is. x. 23 נֶחֱרָצָה, and also מְהוּמָה in ver. 16 below.

[Ver. 7.—Masc. verb with the fem. שִׂפְתֵי, as in ver. 2; x. 21, 22.]

Ver. 9.—[Bött. (§ 412, 3) suggests rhythmical reasons for the peculiar and solitary form יֶאֱהָב, usually יֶאֱהַב. Comp. Green, § 112, 5, *c.*—A.]

Ver. 15.—The construction is elliptical; טוֹב־לֵב is logically a genitive limiting the יְמֵי of clause *a*, and מִשְׁתֶּה is a predicate to it: "the days of him who is cheerful in heart are a feast," *etc.* Comp. Hitzig on the passage.

Ver. 21.—The Infin. לֶכֶת without לְ made dependent on the verb יְיַשֶּׁר (Ewald, *Lehrb.*, § 285, *a.*)

Ver. 22.—The Infin. abs. הָפֵר is here naturally prefixed, instead of the finite verb, as *e. g.*, in xii. 7. [Active used instead of passive, with an indefinite subject, in Hiphil and Piel as well as Kal. infinitives. See Böttcher, § 990, 1, *a.*—A.]

Ver. 25.—Instead of וְיַצֵּב we must with Hitzig, *etc.*, and in accordance with the anc. versions read וַיַּצֵּב; for the optative rendering "and let him establish," *etc.* (Bertheau) does not agree with the parallelism. [Bött. regards it as a Jussive, expressing that necessity which is seen to be involved in the moral order of the world (§ 964, 7).—A.]

Digitized by Google

EXEGETICAL.

1. Vers. 1-7. Against sins of the tongue of various kinds.—**A soft answer turneth away wrath,**—lit., "bringeth or turneth back passion," comp. Is. ix. 11, 16, 20. The opposite of this "turning back" or "beating down" the violence of wrath is the "stirring it up," causing wrath to flash up or blaze out. Comp. Eccles. x. 4; Ps. xviii. 8, 9.—With the use of the epithet "soft, gentle" (רַךְ), comp. xxv. 15.—"A bitter word" (see critical notes) is more exactly "a word of pain," *i. e.*, a smarting, offensive, violent word such as the passionate or embittered man speaks.

Ver. 2. **The tongue of the wise maketh knowledge attractive,** lit., "maketh knowledge good" (see critical notes); *i. e.*, presents knowledge in apt, well arranged and winning ways (comp. xxx. 29; Is. xxiii. 16). In contrast with this "the fool's mouth poureth forth folly," *i. e.*, in its repulsively confused and noisy utterances, brings to view not wisdom and true discernment, but only folly. "Poureth forth," a decidedly stronger expression than "proclaimeth," chap. xii. 23.

Ver. 3. Comp. 2 Chron. xvi. 9; Ecclesiast. xv. 19; xvii. 16; xxiii. 28; also Ps. cxxxix. 1 sq.; Matt. x. 30; Heb. iv. 13.

Ver. 4. **Gentleness of the tongue is a tree of life.**—With this use of the noun rendered "gentleness" (not "health") comp. xiv. 30, and for the expression "tree of life," xi. 30.—**But transgression therewith is a wound in the spirit.**—The noun סֶלֶף probably does not here mean "perverseness" (BERTHEAU, E. V., *etc.*), but apparently "trespass, transgression," which seems to be its meaning also in chap. xi. 8 (comp. HITZIG). Transgression with the tongue is, however, probably not here falsehood (LUTHER, and the older commentators; comp. EWALD, "falling with the tongue"), but its misuse in the exciting of strife and contention, and so "irritation, excitement" (UMBREIT, ELSTER). "A wound in the spirit," *i. e.*, disturbance and destruction by restless passion of the regulated and normal state of the spirit; comp. Is. lxv. 14.—HITZIG conjectures a corruption of the text, and therefore translates the second clause in partial accordance with the LXX, Syriac and Chaldee versions, "and whoso eateth its fruit (the tree of life), stretcheth himself comfortably (! ?)." [RUEETSCHI (as before cited, p. 143) carries the idea of gentleness through the two clauses as the central idea; "it is precisely with this gentle speech which otherwise does so much good, that the wicked is wont to deceive, and then one is by this more sorely and deeply stricken and distressed than before."—A.]

Ver. 5. Comp. i. 7; xiii. 1.—**But he that regardeth reproof is wise** (reproof on the part of his father, or in general from his parents). For this verb, "is wise, prudent, dealeth prudently," comp. xix. 25; 1 Sam. xxiii. 22. —Ver. 6. **In the house of the righteous is a great treasure,**—lit., "house of the righteous," probably an accusative of place. The treasure stored up in such a house is the righteousness that prevails in it, a source and pledge of abiding prosperity. [HOLDEN and some others make the earthly treasure too prominent, as though the direct teaching of the verse were that "temporal prosperity attends the righteous." We find in the verse rather an import that holds equally good in the absence of outward abundance.—A.] The direct opposite of this is the "trouble" that is found in the gains of the wicked.—Ver. 7. With clause *a* compare x. 31. [A rendering of יְזָרוּ is urged by RUEETSCHI, that is more in keeping with its general import, and particularly its meaning in chap. xx. 8, 26, *viz.:* to "sift," or "winnow;" the lips of the wise *sift* knowledge, separating the chaff, preserving the pure grain. —A.]—**But the heart of fools** (doeth) **not so,** *i. e.*, with him it is quite otherwise than with the heart of the wise man which spreads abroad wisdom and knowledge; a suggestion, brief indeed but very expressive, of the mighty difference between the influences that go forth from the wise man and the fool. HITZIG, to avoid this interpretation of לֹא־כֵן, which, as he thinks, is "intolerably flat," explains the expression in accordance with Is. xvi. 6, by "that which is not so as it is asserted to be," and therefore by "error or falsehood;" he therefore takes this as an accusative object to the verb "spread abroad," which is to be supplied from clause *a*. The LXX and Syr. adopt still another way, according to which כֵּן is an adjective with the meaning "sure, right,"—"the fool's heart is not sure," not certain of its matters, and therefore incompetent to teach others (so also BERTHEAU). This last explanation is doubtless possible, and yet the first seems at all events the simplest and most obvious. [This is also the rendering of the E. V., *etc.;* S., N., M., W. agree substantially with the last view, but differ in the grammatical connection of the word "sound, right," S. and M. making it a predicative epithet, N. and W. making it the object, "what is not sound," "folly."—A.]

2. Vers. 8-15. Of God's abhorrence of the wicked heart of the ungodly.—With ver. 8 comp. xxi. 27; xxviii. 9; also ver. 29 below. "Sacrifice" and "prayer" are not here contrasted as the higher and the lower [so BURGON, quoted by WORDSWORTH]; but "sacrifice" is a gift to God, "prayer" is desiring from Him. Comp. Is. i. 11, 15, and besides passages like Hos. vi. 6; Mic. vi. 6-8; Jer. vii. 21; Ps. xl. 6 (7); li. 17 (18), *etc.*—Ver. 9 stands in the relation, as it were, of an explanation of or a reason for ver. 8; comp. xi. 20; xii. 22.—**But he loveth him that searcheth after righteousness.**—"Searcheth after" ["pursueth," as it were, Piel part.], stronger than "followeth," chap. xxi. 21; comp. xi. 19; also Deut. xvi. 20; Ps. xxxiv. 14 (15).

Ver. 10. (There is) **sharp correction for him that forsaketh the way,** lit., "is to the one forsaking the path," *i. e.*, the man that turns aside from the right way (comp. ii. 13).—**He that hateth reproof must die,**—lit., "will die." Comp. Rom. viii. 13. This "death" is the very "sharp correction" mentioned in the first clause, just as he who hates correction is identical with the man who forsakes the

Digitized by Google

way. Comp. x. 17.—Ver. 11. **Hell** (Sheol) **and the world of the dead are before Jehovah,**—*i. e.*, are not concealed from Him, lie open and uncovered before His view, comp. Ps. cxxxix. 8; Job xxvi. 6. In the latter passage אֲבַדּוֹן, lit. "place of destruction, abyss of the pit" stands, as it does here, as a synonym of Sheol; so likewise in Prov. xxvii. 20.—**How much more** ('אַף כִּ as in xi. 87) **the hearts of the sons of men**; comp. Jer. xvii. 10: Heb. iv. 13.—Observe furthermore how this proverb also stands related to the next preceding, giving its reason, as in vers. 8 and 9.

Ver. 12. **To wise men doth he not go**; among them he will find deliverance from his folly—by stern reproof, it is true, and censure and reprimand; comp. xiii. 1, 20. HITZIG unnecessarily proposes to read, with the LXX, "with" instead of "to," "with wise men he doth not associate."

Ver. 13. **A joyous heart maketh the countenance cheerful.**—The verb "maketh good" (ver. 2), "maketh pleasant" is here equivalent to "brighteneth." —**But in sorrow of the heart is the spirit stricken.**—Others, UMBREIT, HITZIG, *etc.*, render "is the breath oppressed, made laborious." It is true that in this way there is produced a better parallelism with the "cheerful countenance" in clause *a*. But in chap. xvii. 22 also (comp. Isa. lxvi. 2) a "broken spirit" is described by this phrase, and not a labored breathing; and instances in which, instead of the outward effect, the inward cause which underlies it is named in the second clause, are by no means unknown elsewhere; comp. x. 20; xii. 22, *etc.*

Ver. 14. With clause *a* compare xiv. 83.—**The face of fools feedeth on folly.**—The K'ri and the ancient versions read 'פִּ (mouth) instead of 'פְּנֵ (face) for which reason many moderns adopt the same reading, *e. g.*, BERTHOLD [DE W., BERTHEAU, E. V., S., N., M., H., who plead not only the authority of the Versions, but the singular number in the verb, and the greater naturalness of the expression]. But as in Ps. xxvii. 8, a "seeking" is predicated of the face [according to the rendering of HITZIG, in which he stands almost alone, "seek him, my face,"—while the vast majority of interpreters make God's face the object sought], so here there might very fitly be ascribed to the face a "feeding on something," a *pasci*, especially as this verb is here employed only in a figurative way, to denote dealing with a matter (comp. xiii. 20). [FUERST (Lex., *sub verbo*) takes the verb in quite a different sense; he makes a second radical meaning to be "to unite with," and then "to delight in." He also recognizes distinctly the use of this plural noun with verbs in the singular. See also NORDHEIMER, *Heb. Gram.* § 759, 3, *a*.—A.].

Ver. 15. **All the days of the afflicted are evil.**—עָנִי is here not the outwardly distressed, the poor, but the inwardly burdened and afflicted, as the parallel in clause *b* shows.—**But he that is of a joyful heart** (hath) **a perpetual feast,**—or, a perpetual feast are his days. The meaning of the verse is a tolerably exact parallel to ver. 18. [To this view of the ver. RUEETSCHI (as above, p. 144) objects that the very general *usus loquendi* refers עָנִי to outward circumstances, and when inward conditions are described by this term it is never in the way of depreciation, other terms being used to describe distress. He renders "all the days of a poor man are (indeed) evil (in regard to his outward circumstances); but whosoever is of a joyful heart has (nevertheless) a continual feast."—A.].

3. Vers. 16 23. Of various other virtues and vices.—With 16, *a*, comp. chap. xvi. 8.—**Than great treasure and trouble with it.**—Trouble, θόρυβος, here probably not the anxiety which apprehends losing the treasure again (BERTHEAU), but the care which accumulated the wealth, and constantly seeks to increase it, Ps. xxxix. 6 (7), (HITZIG). [RUEETSCHI observing the more general use of the noun, understands it to refer to the confusion and disorder in human society attendant upon riches without the fear of God.—A.].

Ver. 17. **Better is a dish of herbs, when love is there,**—literally, "a portion of green," *i. e.*, vegetables (Jer. xl. 5; lii. 24; 2 Kings xxv. 30). Vegetables represent simple fare in general (comp. Dan. i. 2), while meat, as always and every where in the East, is holiday fare, especially the flesh of fatted oxen (Luke xv. 23, 30).—Observe, furthermore, how the verse before us exhibits on the one hand a meaning exactly parallel to the preceding, while on the other hand it presents a climax to its ideas (fear of God—love to one's neighbor; trouble—hate).—As a substantial parallel compare the proverb in MEIDANI II. 422: "Want with love is better than hatred with riches."—With ver. 18 comp. above, ver. 1, as also xxvi. 21; xxviii. 25; xxix. 22; Ecclesiast. xxviii. 11-13.

Ver. 19. **The way of the slothful is as a hedge of thorns,** *i. e.*, because he is always encountering obstacles and hinderances, does not come away having accomplished his life's work, but must find his foot every where entangled and kept back. [The special aptness of this figure in Palestine is amply illustrated in HACKETT's *Scripture Illustrations*, THOMSON's *The Land and the Book*, *etc.*—A]. It is otherwise with the "upright," *i. e.*, the man who unmoved and unremitting goes about the performance of his duty, and continues with vigorous efficiency in the work of his calling. His way is, according to clause *b*, "built up," *i. e.*, lit. raised by throwing up a ridge (Isa. lvii. 14; lxii. 10; Jer. xviii. 15, *etc.*), a way which leads easily and surely to its end.—HITZIG without any necessity reads עָרִין for עָצֵל, to obtain as he thinks a more appropriate antithesis to the word "upright," (יְשָׁרִים). But that the slothful may be very fitly contrasted with the upright or righteous, appears abundantly from proverbs like x. 26; xxviii. 19; vi. 10, *etc.*

Ver. 20. With clause *a* compare the literally identical first half of x. 1.—**But a foolish man**, lit. "a fool of a man;" comp. xxi. 20, and the similarly constructed expression "a wild ass of a man," Gen. xvi. 12. BERTHEAU wrongly renders "the most foolish of men."

Digitized by Google

Ver. 21. **Folly** (here unreasonable conduct, senseless action) **is joy to him that lacketh wisdom.** Comp. x. 23.—**Goeth straight forward,** lit. "maketh straight to go." Going straight forward is naturally acting rightly in moral and religious matters.

Ver. 22. (There is) **Failure of plans where there is no counsel.** Literally, "a breaking of plans" is, comes to pass, "where no counsel is." For the meaning comp. xi. 14, especially also with respect to clause *b*.—**They come to pass,** *i. e.*, the plans. The singular of the verb is used in the Heb. distributively, as in chap. iii. 18 (see notes there).

Ver. 23. **A man hath joy through the answer of his mouth, and a word in due season, how good is it!** That the second clause cannot be antithetic to the first (HITZIG), but stands as its explanation or its climax is evident; for the "word in its time" is just the "answer" of clause *a*, exciting joy because apt and exactly meeting the inquiry.—Comp. furthermore parallels like x. 20, 31, 32, *etc.*

4. Vers. 24-33. Of several other virtues especially of the religious life.—**An upward path of life is the way of the wise;** lit. "a path of life upward is to the wise," *i. e.*, the man of understanding walks in a way which as a way of life leads ever upward, to ever higher degrees of moral purity, elevation and power, but also in the same ratio to an ever-increasing prosperity. A reference to heaven as the final limit of this upward movement of the life of the righteous is so far forth indirectly included, as the antithesis to the "upward;" the "hell beneath" (hell downwards, hell to which one tends downward), suggests a hopeless abode in the dark kingdom of the dead, as the final destination of the sinner's course of life. Therefore we have here again the idea of future existence and retribution (comp. xi. 7; xiv. 32)—a meaning which BERTHEAU and HITZIG seek in vain to take from the proverb. Comp. ELSTER on this passage.

Ver. 25. **The house of the proud will Jehovah destroy.** For the verb comp. ii. 22. By "house" is here meant not the mere dwelling, but also the family of the proud, just as in xiv. 11; compare also xiv. 1.—**And establisheth the border of the widow,** *i. e.*, the innocent widow who is in danger of being wronged by the proud through encroachment upon her borders. Comp. moreover with this expression Deut. xxxii. 8.

Ver. 26. Compare xi. 20.—**But pure** (in His sight) **are gracious words,** here probably specifically words sweetly consoling, words of love and compassion toward troubled souls, comp. xvi. 24. Such words are in Jehovah's judgment pure or precious, *i. e.*, with a pure and genuine ring; comp. Ps. xix. 8, 9 (9, 10).—HITZIG proposes instead of טְהוֹרִים to read טְפֻלִים [adhere, cleave] from which comes the meaning strengthening the antithesis of the parallel: "and pleasant words cleave fast (?)."

Ver. 27. **He troubleth his own house that seeketh unjust gain.** For the last expression "spoileth spoil," *i. e.*, goes after unlawful gains, seeks plunder, comp. i. 19; for the former phrase "disturb or trouble the house," xi. 29. The sentence as a whole seems to be aimed especially at unjust judges, who are willing to be bribed by gifts, in contrast with the judge that "hates gifts," and so is incorruptible and unchangeably upright; comp. xxviii. 16.

Ver. 28. **The heart of the righteous studieth to answer,** *i. e.*, reflects upon its answers with all care, that it may utter nothing evil or perverse, while the wicked thoughtlessly "pours forth" his evil and perverse thoughts (pours forth, comp. ver. 2); compare Matth. xii. 35.—With ver. 29 comp. ver. 8.

Ver. 30. **A friendly look rejoiceth the heart.** Lit. "lustre of the eyes;" it denotes, like the "light of the countenance" in chap. xvi. 15, the cheerful beaming of the eye of the friendly, which exerts on one's neighbor also an influence refreshing to the heart, especially at the time when, as clause *b* indicates, it communicates a "good message," "joyful tidings" (comp. xxv. 25). For this "rich nourishing of the bones" (lit., making fat), comp. xi. 25; xiii. 4; also xvi. 24.—In this conception of the verse which is the simplest and on all sides well guaranteed, according to which clause *b* only defines more exactly the import of clause *a*, there is no need either of giving an objective cast to the idea of "brightness to the eye," as though it meant "friendly recognition" (LUTHER, DE WETTE, BERTHEAU), or of changing מְאוֹר to מַרְאֵה (HITZIG).

Ver. 31. **The ear that heareth the reproof of life,** *i. e.*, reproof which has true life for its end, which points out the way to it, and for that very reason already in advance has life in itself and imparts it.—**Will abide among the wise,** *i. e.*, will itself become wise (xiii. 20), and therefore permanently belongs to the circle of the wise. For this verb to "abide" (לִין), lit. to pass the night, *i. e.*, to tarry long at some place, comp. Ps. xxv. 13; xlix. 12 (13); Job xix. 4. The ear here stands by synecdoche for the hearer, as in Job xxix. 11; Ex. x. 26; 1 Kings xix. 18.

Ver. 32. **He that refuseth correction despiseth himself,** lit. "undervalues, lightly values his soul," in so far as he does not ensure life, in so far as, without knowing and willing it, he loves death more than life (comp. viii. 36).—**But he that heedeth reproof getteth understanding;** comp. iv. 5, 7; xvi. 16. The man who "getteth understanding" is, however, according to xix. 8 the very man who does not hate his own soul but loves it.

Ver. 33. With clause *a* compare i. 7; ix. 10.—**And before honor is humility.** Humility here plainly appears as the necessary correlate to the fear of God, and as a chief manifestation of wisdom, which is elsewhere named as that which confers honor, *e. g.*, iii. 16; viii. 18. Compare xviii. 12, *b*, where the second clause of the verse before us occurs again.—The entire verse, by virtue of its somewhat general character, is equally well adapted to close a long series of proverbs, and to open a new section. It is therefore unnecessary, as HITZIG does, to transfer it

Digitized by Google

to the following chapter, and to regard it as a sort of superscription to the second half of that division of the Book of Proverbs in which we now are (chap. xvi.-xxii.).

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

Among the proverbs of the chapter before us, which hardly admit of a grouping according to any well-established, clearly conspicuous principle of classification (comp. the four divisions which are distinguished in the "Exegetical Notes:" vers. 1-7; 8-15; 16-23; 24-33), several stand out as of no slight theological and soteriological importance,—especially the beautiful reference to the omniscience of God, the holy and righteous Ruler, in ver. 3 and ver. 11,—and the twice repeated emphasizing of the religious worthlessness of outward shows of reverence for God, without true devotion and consecration in the heart, vers. 8 and 29. The last mentioned truth is among the favorite ideas of the enlightened prophetic teachers and men of God in the Old Testament; (compare the parallel passages cited above in connection with vers. 8). It lets the clear light of that evangelical saving grace, which was already operative under the economy of the law, but which only in Christ rose as a full-orbed sun, shine with quite peculiar brightness on the dark ground of Old Testament life. In this connection there is, it is true, the distinction to be made (noticed above under ver. 8) between "sacrifice" and "prayer;" that the former term describes a gift brought to God, the latter a desire directed to Him. Yet this is by no means an essential difference; for both, sacrifice and prayer, which indeed falls likewise under the category of offering in the broadest sense (Ps. cxix. 108; Heb. xiii. 15), come under consideration here only as general tokens of reverence for God; and the value of both is clearly defined by this test, whether the state of heart in those who bring them is or is not well pleasing to God (comp. Isa. xxix. 13; Matt. xv. 7 sq.); in other words, whether the offering brought is a purely outward act, or the fruit of a sincere self-consecration of the entire personality in spirit and in truth, a "reasonable service" in the sense of Rom. xii. 1.

Closely related to the scope of these proverbs is what was said above, on ver. 17, of the worthlessness of outward shows of beneficence, especially free hospitality without inward love (comp. 1 Cor. xiii. 2).—Furthermore a specially serious consideration is due to the warnings against low greed and avarice, as leading, nevertheless, to the destruction of one's own home: ver. 6 and 27; to the repeated allusions to the necessity that one readily submit himself to reproof and correction for his faults: vers. 5, 10, 12, 31, 32; to the beautiful commendation of humility as the first step to true honor: ver. 33; and finally to the reiterated reference to the righteous judgment of God, which reaches its completion only in the life to come: ver. 25 (see notes on this passage).

HOMILETIC AND PRACTICAL.

Homily on the entire chapter: Right sensibility or a pure heart the only true service of God (1 Sam. xv. 22), demonstrated 1) in good and perverse conduct with the mouth and tongue (ver. 1-7); 2) in proper worship or the religious life (ver. 8-15); 3) in the intercourse of man with his neighbors (vers. 16-33).—Or again; Love (to God and men) as the germ and the true norm of all religious rectitude (Hos. vi. 6; Matt. ix. 13; xii. 7).—Comp. STÖCKER: How true prudence (wisdom) must guard man against sins 1) of the tongue (1-9); 2) of the heart and the hands (10-22); 3) against other sins of various kinds (23-33).—In a similar way WOHLFARTH: The effect of prudence; a means of guarding one's self against sins of various kinds.

Ver. 1-7. STARKE (on vers. 1, 2); when genuine piety exists there will not be wanting other manifestations of friendliness and gentleness. Even where there is occasion for earnestness in the punishment of transgressions, a friendly spirit must still be combined with it. Earnestness without friendship profits as little as friendliness without earnestness. — GEIER (on ver. 3): If God knows all things then He knows also His children's need, and is intent on their help and deliverance.—(On ver. 5): If even to the most capable and powerful spirits there is still need of good discipline and instruction, how much more to the indolent and drowsy!—(On ver. 6): In connection with temporal blessings be intent upon righteousness in their attainment, contentment in their possession, prudence and system in their employment, submission in their loss!—[ARNOT (on ver. 1): Truth alone may be hated, and love alone despised; man will flee from the one and trample on the other; but when truth puts on love, and love leans on truth, in that hallowed partnership lies the maximum of moral power within the reach of man in the present world.—TRAPP (on ver. 6): Every righteous man is a rich man, whether he hath more or less of the things of this life. For, *first*, he hath plenty of that which is precious. *Secondly*, propriety: what he hath is his own].

Vers. 8-19. CRAMER (on ver. 8): It is not works that make the man good, but when the man is justified, then his works are also good; God in His grace makes well-pleasing to Himself the works that come of faith, even though great imperfections still mingle with them.—STARKE (on ver. 11): The doctrine of God's omniscience is already in the Old Testament revealed frequently enough, and so clearly that no one can excuse himself on the ground of ignorance concerning it.—(On ver. 12): He is wise who gladly associates with those from whom he can learn something, though it be disagreeable to the flesh to do so.—ZELTNER (on vers. 13 sq.): He is the most prosperous man who possesses the treasure of a good conscience and seeks to preserve it; he can always be joyful in God (Acts xxiv. 16).—WOHLFARTH (vers. 13-17): *The joyous heart.* What can all the good things of this earth profit us when our inner nature is in trouble and our countenance sad? How rich are we, even with little earthly possession, if we only possess the one good of a conscience at peace, and a heart joyful in God!—VON GERLACH (on ver. 19): The sluggard lets his paths grow over, *i. e.*, his means of acquisition go to waste, and his re-

Digitized by Google

sources decay.—[Charnock (on ver. 11): God knows the whole state of the dead—things that seem to be out of all being; He knows the thoughts of the devils and damned creatures, whom He hath cast out of His care forever into the arms of His justice; much more is He acquainted with the thoughts of living men, *etc.*]

Vers. 20–33. Hasius (on vers. 22, 23): Many eyes see more than one, and many souls think more than one; therefore never esteem thyself so wise that thou shouldst not seek others' counsel. . . . A good thought on which one falls at the right time is not to be valued with much gold.—Wohlfarth (on vers. 22–26): Important as it is in general that one testify the truth, as important is the way in which this is done.—Von Gerlach (on ver. 24): The very direction of the way which the wise enters saves him from extreme disasters; it leads toward God, toward the kingdom of eternal light, welfare and life.—(On ver. 33): Honor one can attain in the way of truth only by giving honor to the Lord alone, *i. e.*, by profound humility (1 Peter v. 6).—J. Lange: True humility consists not in all manner of outward gestures, but in the fact that one in perfect self-denial agree with the will of God, Luke i. 38.—[W. Bates (on ver. 33): Humility preserves the true and noble freedom of the mind of man, secures his dear liberty and peaceful dominion of himself. This is the effect of excellent wisdom].

---

2. *Admonition to a walk in the fear of God and obedience.*

Chap. XVI. 1.—XXII. 16.

a) Admonition to trust in God as the wise Ruler and Governor of the world.

Chap. XVI.

1 Man's are the counsels of the heart,
but the answer of the tongue is Jehovah's.
2 All the ways of a man are pure in his own eyes,
but Jehovah weigheth the spirits.
3 Commit thy works to Jehovah,
so will thy plans be established.
4 Jehovah hath made every thing for its end,
even the wicked for the day of evil.
5 An abomination to Jehovah is every one who is proud in heart,
assuredly he will not go unpunished.
6 By mercy and truth is iniquity atoned,
and through the fear of Jehovah one departeth from evil.
7 If Jehovah hath pleasure in the ways of a man,
he maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him.
8 Better is a little with righteousness,
than great revenues without right.
9 Man's heart deviseth his way,
but Jehovah directeth his steps.
10 Decision belongeth to the lips of the king,
in judgment his mouth speaketh not wickedly.
11 The scale and just balances belong to Jehovah,
His work are all the weights of the bag.
12 It is an abomination to kings to commit wickedness,
for by righteousness is the throne established.
13 A delight to kings are righteous lips,
and he that speaketh uprightly is loved.
14 The wrath of a king (is as) messengers of death,
but a wise man appeaseth it.
15 In the light of the king's countenance is life,
and his favor is as a cloud of the latter rain.
16 To gain wisdom—how much better is it than gold!
and to attain understanding to be preferred to silver!

Digitized by Google

17 The path of the upright departeth from evil;
he preserveth his soul that giveth heed to his way.
18 Before destruction cometh pride,
and before a fall a haughty spirit.
19 Better is it to be humble with the lowly,
than to divide spoil with the proud.
20 He that giveth heed to the word findeth good,
and he who trusteth Jehovah, blessed is he!
21 The wise in heart shall be called prudent,
and grace on the lips increaseth learning.
22 Understanding is a fountain of life to him that hath it,
but the correction of fools is folly.
23 The heart of the wise maketh his mouth wise,
and increaseth learning upon his lips.
24 As honey of the comb are pleasant words,
sweet to the soul and health to the bones.
25 There is a way that seemeth right to man,
but its end are ways of death.
26 The spirit of the laborer laboreth for him,
for his mouth urgeth him on.
27 A worthless man searcheth after evil,
and on his lips is as it were scorching fire.
28 A perverse man sendeth abroad strife,
and a backbiter separateth friends.
29 A violent man enticeth his neighbor,
and leadeth him in a way that is not good.
30 Shutting his eyes to devise mischief,
biting his lips, he bringeth evil to pass.
31 A crown of glory is the hoary head;
in the way of righteousness it shall be found.
32 He that is slow to anger is better than the mighty,
and he that ruleth his spirit than he that taketh a city.
33 The lot is cast into the lap,
but from Jehovah is all its decision.

GRAMMATICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1.—In מיהוה the מן stands as simply synonymous with the ל *auctoris* of the first clause.

Ver. 3.—[A masc. verb agreeing with the fem. subject מחשבתיך, which is less unnatural where the verb precedes; see Bött., § 936, *a.*—A.]

Ver. 4.—[למענהו distinguished by the article and the daghesh as the noun מענה with preposition and suffix, and not the comp. preposition למען with a suffix. See Green, *Heb. Gram.*, § 246, 2, *a.*—A.]

Ver. 7.—[ישלם, Hiph. Imperf. written *defective*. Bött. suggests the proper reading as ישלם "absimilated" from the following א. See § 1013—A.]

Ver. 13.—[Ordinarily feminine forms of adjectives are employed in Hebrew to supply the lack of neuter and abstract forms. Occasionally as in ישרים masc. forms are used in elevated style. See Bött., § 707, 2.—A.]

Ver. 16.—[Both the masc. and fem. forms of the Infin. constr. are here used, קנה and קנות, but with a masc. predicate, the Niph. part. נבחר, which has here the meaning of the Latin part. in *dus.* Bött., §§ 990, 3, β, and 997, 2, *c.*—A.] For examples of the form קנה comp. xxi. 3; xxxi. 4.

Ver. 19.—שפל in שפל־רוח is here probably not to be regarded as the adjective, as in xxix. 23; Is. lvii. 15 (so Bertheau, Elster, and others regard it), but an Infinitive, which is therefore equivalent to *humiliari* (Vulgate, comp. Ewald, Umbreit, Hitzig, *etc.*) For in the second clause an Infin. is the corresponding term: חלק שלל, "to divide spoil;" comp. with this Is. liii. 12. [Fuerst, however (*Lex.*, *sub verbo*), pronounces decidedly in favor of the adjective construction. Bött. regards it as an Infin., § 987, 5, *a.*—A.]

Ver. 20.—השכיל appears in Neh. viii. 13 construed with אל instead of על; compare, however, for this interchange of אל and על chaps. xxix. 5; Jer. vi. 10, 19, *etc.*

Ver. 27.—[שפתיו is one of the few instances in which in the Masoretic punctuation a dual or plural form is disregarded in the vocalization of the suffix. Cases of the opposite kind are not rare. Bött., § 886, *c.* The LXX conform to the K'thibh.—A.]

Digitized by Google

*Ver. 28.—נִרְגָּן (ψίθυρος, Ecclesiast. v. 14), is cognate with רָגַן, a verb which in the Arabic means *susurro*, to whisper.

Ver. 30.—עָצָה, related to עָצַם, *clausit*, is found only here in the Old Testament. [It is a gesture accompanying and expressive of crafty scheming; FUERST, s. v.]

Ver. 33.—For the impersonal use of the passive יוּטַל with the accusative, comp. Gen. iv. 18; xvii. 6; Jos. vii. 15; Ps. lxxii. 15, *etc.*

EXEGETICAL.

1. Vers. 1–3. Of God as the wise disposer and controller of all things in general.—**Man's are the counsels of the heart, but the answer of the tongue is Jehovah's.**—The "answer of the tongue" might indeed of itself signify the answer corresponding to the tongue, *i. e.*, the supplicating tongue, and so denote "the granting of man's request" (ELSTER, comp. UMBREIT, BERTHEAU, *etc.*) But since the *heart* with its hidden plans and counsels (lit., "arrangements:" מַעַרְכִים equivalent to the more common fem. מַעֲרָכוֹת), is here plainly contrasted with the tongue as the instrument in the disclosure of such plans (comp. x. 8; xiv. 20, and numerous exx.), therefore the "answer of the tongue" must here be "the movement and utterance of the tongue," and Jehovah comes into the account as the giver of right words, from which health and life go forth, as the dispenser of the wholesome "word in due season" (chap. xv. 23); comp. Matth. x. 19, 20; also Rom. viii. 26; 2 Cor. iii. 5. LUTHER therefore renders correctly "But from the Lord cometh what the tongue shall speak;" in general HITZIG is also right, except that he would unnecessarily read "to" Jehovah לי׳ instead of מי׳, and so thinks too exclusively of Jehovah merely as the judge of the utterances of man's tongue. The idea "Man proposes, God disposes" (*der Mensch denkt, Gott lenkt*), forms moreover quite as naturally the proper subject of discourse in the verse before us, as below in vers. 9 and 33. [Our English version sacrifices entirely the antithetic nature and force of the verse.—A.]

Ver. 2. **All the ways of a man are pure in his own eyes**, *i. e.*, according to his own judgment, comp. xii. 15. Lit., "something clean;" comp. EWALD, *Lehrb.*, § 307, *c*.—**But Jehovah weigheth the spirits**, *i. e.*, he tries them, not literally ponderable, with reference to their moral weight; he wishes to test their moral competence. The "ways" and the "spirits" here stand contrasted as the outward action and the inward disposition; comp. 1 Sam. xvi. 7. In the parallel passage, chap. xxi. 2, "hearts" (לִבּוֹת) occurs instead of "spirits" (רוּחוֹת) (compare also xxi. 12) and "right" (יָשָׁר) instead of "clean" (זַךְ).

Ver. 3. **Commit thy works to Jehovah.**—For this phrase to "roll something on some one," *i. e.*, to commit and entrust it wholly to him. comp. Ps. xxii. 8 (9), also xxxvii. 5 (where עַל is used instead of אֶל, "upon" instead of "to").—**So will thy plans be established**,—*i. e.*, thy thoughts and purposes, those according to which thou proposest to shape thy "works," will then have a sure basis and result. Comp. xix. 21; Ps. xc. 17.

2. Vers. 4-9. God's wise and righteous administration in respect to the rewarding of good and the punishment of evil.—**Jehovah hath made everything for its end.**—The noun מַעֲנֶה here signifies, not "answer," as in ver. 1, or in xv. 1, 23; but in general that which corresponds with the thing, the *end* of the thing. The suffix refers back to the "all, all things." The Vulgate renders "*propter semet ipsum*," but this would have לְמַעֲנוֹ. [See critical notes. BERTHEAU, KAMPH., DE W., N., S., M., *etc.*, agree with our author in the interpretation which is grammatically most defensible, and doctrinally least open to exception. An absolute Divine purpose and control in the creation and administration of the world is clearly announced, and also the strength of the bond that joins sin and misery.—A.]—**Even the wicked for the day of evil**, *i. e.*, to experience the day of evil, and then to receive His well merited punishment. It is not specifically the day of final judgment that is directly intended (as though the doctrine here were that of a predestination of the ungodly to eternal damnation, as many of the older Reformed interpreters held), but any day of calamity whatsoever, which God has fixed for the ungodly, whether it may overtake him in this or in the future life. Comp. the "day of destruction," Job xxi. 30; the "day of visitation," Is. x. 3. [HOLDEN's rendering "even the wicked He daily sustains," is suggested by his strong aversion to the doctrine of reprobation, but is not justified by the use of the Hebrew phrase, or by the slightest requirement or allowance in the parallelism. Liberal interpreters like NOYES find not the slightest reason for following him.—A.]

Ver. 5. With clause *a* compare xv. 9, 25, 26; with *b*, xi. 21.—In regard to the two verses interpolated by the LXX (and Vulgate) after ver. 5, see HITZIG on this passage.

Ver. 6. **By mercy and truth is iniquity atoned.**—"Mercy and truth" here unquestionably, as in chap. iii. 3 (where see notes), describes a relation of man to his neighbor, and not to God, as BERTHEAU maintains (see in reply to his view especially HOFMANN's *Schriftbew*, I., 518 sq.). [Nor is it God's mercy and truth, as HOLDEN suggests]. Loving and faithful conduct towards one's neighbor is, however, plainly not in and of itself named as the ground of the expiation of sin, but only so far forth as it is a sign and necessary expression of a really penitent and believing disposition of heart, and so is a correlative to the fear of God, which is made prominent in the second clause; just as in the expression of Jesus with reference to the sinning woman; Luke vii. 47; or as in Isa. lviii. 7; Dan. iv. 24, *etc.*—**One departeth from evil**, lit.,

Digitized by Google

"there is remaining far from evil," *i. e.*, this is the result: so ver. 17.—"Evil" is here according to the parallelism *moral evil* (not misfortune, calamity, in conformity with vers. 4, 27, as HITZIG holds). This is however mentioned here with an included reference to its necessary evil results and penalties; therefore, if one chooses, it is evil and calamity together; comp. vers. 17. —With vers. 7 compare xxv. 21, 22, where as means to the conciliation of enemies there is mentioned the personal loving disposition of the man involved, who here appears as an object of the divine complacency.—With vers. 8 comp. xv. 16; with clause *b* in particular, xiii. 23.—Ver. 9. **Man's heart deviseth his way.** The Piel of the verb here denotes a laborious consideration, a reflecting on this side and that.—**But Jehovah directeth his steps.** He determines them, gives them their direction, guides them (comp. notes on ver. 1, *b*). UMBREIT, BERTHEAU, EWALD, ELSTER, [NOYES, STUART,] "he makes them sure." But then another conjugation (Pilel, יְכוֹנֵן) would probably have been necessary, as in Ps. xxxvii. 23. For the Hiphil comp. moreover Jer. x. 23.

3. Vers. 10-15. Of kings as intermediate agents or instruments in God's wise administration of the world.—A divine **decision belongeth to the lips of the king.** קֶסֶם, oracular decision or prediction, here used in a good sense of a divine utterance (*effatum divinum;* comp. in the Vulg., *divinatio*). As representative of Jehovah, the supreme ruler and judge, a king, and especially the theocratic king of Israel, speaks words of divine validity and dignity (comp. Ps. lxxxii. 6; John x. 34), which give an absolutely certain decision, particularly in contested judicial questions. Therefore that continues true which the second clause asserts: **In judgment his mouth doth not speak wickedly.** "He deceives not, sins not" is not possibly, a *wish* ("his mouth should not err in judgment," UMBREIT, BERTHEAU), but "the passage rather lays down the principle: *the King can do no wrong*, in a narrower assertion of it, and with this difference, that it is here no political fiction, but a believing conviction. Righteousness at least in the final resort was under the theocratic monarchy of the Old Testament so absolute a demand of the idea, that one could not conceive it to be unrealized" (HITZIG). [We have here the theory of the king's relations and obligations, and a clear statement of the presumptions of which he should, according to the divine order, have the benefit. These must be clearly overthrown by him, before the people are entitled to set them aside. Comp. Rom. xiii. 1, 2. Had this proverb been penned near the end, instead of near the beginning of the Jewish theocracy, it would have been difficult to avoid the suggestion that the ideal and the actual are often strangely, sharply at variance.—A.].

Ver. 11. **The scale and just balances belong to Jehovah.** The proposition expresses the idea of an ownership in Jehovah as the first cause: for like agriculture (Ecclesiast. vii. 15) God instituted weights and measures, as an indispensable ordinance and instrument in just business intercourse.—**His works are all the weights of the bag.** His weights the oriental merchant (in Persia, *e. g.*, even at the present day) is wont to carry in a bag; comp. Deut. xxv. 13; Mic. vi. 11. Stones were in preference employed as weights because they do not wear away so easily, as iron, *e. g.*, which from rusting easily changes its weight. Comp. UMBREIT on this passage. BERTHEAU is quite too artificial. "His work is all of it stones of the bag," *i. e.*, is as sharply and accurately defined "as the smallest and finest weights (?)."—Vers. 12, 13. Two verses closely connected, expressing a single truth, which is brought out first negatively and then positively.—It is an abomination to kings to commit iniquity; *i. e*, injustice practised or at least attempted by their subjects is an abomination to them, representing, as they do, God and divine justice. Comp. ver. 10, and with clause *b* also especially xxv. 5.—**And he that speaketh uprightly is loved.** For this use of the plur. masc. of יָשָׁר, upright, which is therefore "upright things, uprightness," comp. Dan. xi. 17; also Job iv. 25.—The verb יֶאֱהָב is either to be taken with an indefinite subject, "him one loveth," *i. e.*, he is loved (UMBREIT. ELSTER, *etc.*), or distributively, "him he loveth," *i. e.*, whoever is king for the time being.

Vers. 14, 15. Verses in like manner closely connected, and essentially expressing but one thought.—**The wrath of the king** (is as) **messengers of death.** This plural in the predicate of the sentence hints that when the king is enraged manifold means and instruments stand at his command for the immediate destruction of the object of his wrath. Remember the despotism and the capricious arbitrariness of Oriental sovereigns, and compare xix. 12; xx. 2; Eccles. viii. 3, 4.—**In the light of the King's countenance is life.** The "friendly countenance," lit. "light of the countenance," as in Ps. iv. 6 (7), is contrasted with the "wrath" ver. 14, *a*, as also are "life" and "death."—**As a cloud of the latter rain.** The harvest rain or latter rain (Vulg., *imber serotinus*) is a rain falling shortly before the harvest, in March or April, whose timely and abundant occurrence is indispensable to the success of Eastern harvests, especially so in Palestine; comp. xi. 14; Jer. iii. 3; v. 24; and particularly Job xxix. 23, 24, which latter passage is here a general parallel. [See THOMSON'S *Land and Book*, I. 130, II. 66].

Vers. 16-26. Of God's righteous administration in respect to the wise and the foolish.—**To gain wisdom—how much better is it than gold,** *i. e.*, than the acquisition of gold; compare, for an example of this abbreviated comparison (*comparatio decurtata*) Job xxviii. 8; Ps. iv. 7 (8), *etc.* For the general sentiment of the ver. compare iii. 14; viii. 10, 11, 19.

Ver. 17. **The path** (the raised, well-graded road מְסִלָּה) **of the upright departeth from evil,** lit. "is abiding far (to abide far) from evil," as in ver. 6; comp. also x. 17; xi. 5, 20.—HITZIG expands the verse by four clauses which he introduces from the LXX, and in such an order that the second clause of the Masoretic text is separated from the first by three of the inserted clauses, and a sixth is appended as a final clause.

Digitized by Google

Yet he fails to give satisfactory proof that this expanded form was the original, three verses being now represented by one.

Ver. 18. Comp. xv. 25, 33.—The word here rendered "fall" (כִּשָּׁלוֹן, tottering, downfall) is used only in this passage in the Old Testament.—With respect to the sentiment of the ver. compare also the Arabic proverb, "The nose is in the heavens, the seat in the mire" (*Nasus in cœlo est, nates in fimo*), and the expression of HORACE "... *feriuntque summos fulgura montes* (Odes, II. 10: 11, 12).

[. . . . . And ever, where
The mountain's summit points in air,
Do bolted lightnings flash."
—THEO. MARTIN's Translation.]

Ver. 19. **Better is it to live humbly with the lowly.** עֲנִיִּים (with which reading of the K'thibh the LXX agrees, while the K'ri reads עֲנָוִים) describes those who are bowed down by troubles, the sufferers, the lowly; comp. Zech. ix. 9.

Ver. 20. **He that giveth heed to the word findeth good,** *i. e.*, naturally, to the word of God, the word *par excellence;* comp. xiii. 13.—With the expression "findeth good, or prosperity," comp. xvii. 20; xix. 8. "Blessed is he!" (אַשְׁרָיו) comp. xiv. 21.

Ver. 21. **The wise in heart shall be called prudent,** understanding, knowing, a possessor of בִּינָה, discernment. Comp. xiv. 33. —**And grace on the lips** (lit. "of lips") **increaseth learning,** *i. e.*, secures for learning an easy access in ever widening circles, comp. 23, *b*. The "grace" or literally the "sweetness" of the lips is here represented as a necessary attendant and helper of wisdom, as in chap. xv. 2.

Vers. 22. **A fountain of life is understanding to him that hath it,** lit. "is the wisdom of its possessor." The thought is here in the first instance unquestionably of the blessing which comes directly to the possessor from his wisdom, and not of its life-dispensing, life-promoting influence on others, as BERTHEAU thinks. For this figure of a "fountain of life" compare x. 11: xiii. 14; xiv. 27.—**But the correction of fools is folly.** The subject, according to the antithetic parallelism, is "folly," as "wisdom" is in clause *a*. The meaning can be no other than this: the folly of fools is for them a source of all possible disadvantages and adversities; the lack of reason is its own punishment (comp. HITZIG on this passage). [So N. and W., while H., M., and S. give to מוּסָר its active meaning, "the instruction of fools," *i. e.*, that which they give, "is folly."—A.].

Ver. 23. Comp. remarks on ver. 21.—**And increaseth learning upon his lips.** "Upon his lips," so far forth as the word that comes from the heart rests on the lips, comp. ver. 27; Ps. xvi. 4; and also the expression "on the tongue," Ps. xv. 3 [where the original expresses more than mere instrumentality (*with* the tongue); "who beareth not slander *on* his tongue" (HUPFELD, on the passage), *etc.*—A.].

Ver. 24. **As honey of the comb are pleasant words,** lit. "words of loveliness," as in xv. 26.—For a like reference to the "honeycomb" see Ps. xix. 10 (11).—**Sweet to the soul.** The adj. מָתוֹק, for which we might expect the plural is to be regarded as a neuter used substantively; something sweet, sweetness; comp. Ezek. iii. 3, and also ver. 2 above.

Ver. 25. Literally identical with xiv. 12;—stricken out by HITZIG from the passage before us, because it is superfluous in the group (vers. 22-30) assumed to consist of eight only (?).—

Vers. 26. **The spirit of the laborer laboreth for him,** *i. e.*, supports him in his labor, impels him to greater perseverance and exertion to gain his daily bread. [ZÖCKLER renders "the hunger," *etc.* So KAMPHAUSEN. This seems to us unnecessary. נֶפֶשׁ is often the animal soul or spirit as distinguished from the higher intellectual, moral and religious nature. It is this spirit that feels the pressure of life's necessities, and impels to effort for their relief: comp. x. 3, *etc.*—A.].—**For his mouth urgeth him on,** *i. e.*, as it longs for food. This verb (construed with עַל and the accus. of the person) denotes, according to Arabic analogies "to heap a load or burden on one" (comp. אֶכֶף, a weight, burden, Job xxxiii. 7) [E. V. "be heavy upon thee"]: and here specifically, to bind one, to drive and force him to do something" (Vulg., *compulit*).—With the general sentiment compare Eccles. vi. 7.

5. Vers. 27-33. A new delineation of God's justice in punishing the wicked and rewarding the pious. Vers. 27-30 form here one connected description of the ungodly, nefarious conduct of the evil men on whom God's judgment falls. Vers. 31, 32 contrast with these wicked men the upright and the gentle in spirit as the only happy men; ver. 33 is a general conclusion pointing us back to the beginning of the chapter.

Ver. 27. **A worthless man** ("man of Belial") **searcheth after evil,** literally "diggeth evil, shovels out evil for himself," *i. e.*, from the pit which he prepares for others, to destroy them (comp. xxvi. 27; Jer. xviii. 20 sq.). For this expression "man of Belial" compare vi. 12.—**On his lips is as it were scorching fire** (comp. ver. 28). The words of the worthless man are here on account of their desolating effects, compared to a blazing or scorching fire (comp. Ezek. xxi. 8; Prov. xxvi. 28; Job xxxi. 12; James iii. 5 sq.).

Vers. 28. With clause *a* compare vi. 14, 19.—**And a backbiter separateth friends,** lit. "divideth off the friend." The singular is not here used collectively, but in a certain sense distributively; "divideth a friend from his fellow." So in xvii. 9; comp. xix. 4.—For the use of נִרְגָּן, "backbiter" comp. xviii. 8; xxvi. 20, 22.

Ver. 29. With clause *a* compare iii. 31; i. 10 sq. With *b* compare Ps. xxxvi. 4 (5); Isa. lxv. 2.—[RUEETSCHI (as above cited, p. 145) thinks these verses (27-29) more expressive if in each the first words are regarded as the predicates, prefixed for emphasis and stronger contrast; "a worthless man is he, *etc.*;" "a perverse, contentious man is he, *etc.*," "a backbiter is he, *etc.*;" "a man of violence is he, *etc.*;" although he may excuse his conduct as mere sport. —A.].

Digitized by Google

Ver. 30 describes more precisely, by two participial clauses which belong to the "man of violence" in ver. 29, the way in which this wicked man executes the ruin which he devises.—**Shutting his eyes to devise mischief**, lit. "to meditate craftiness;" comp. ii. 12, vi. 14.—**Biting his lips**. With this description, "pressing in, pressing together his lips," comp. vi. 13; x. 10, where this verb is used of the corresponding action with the eyes.

Ver. 31. With clause *a* comp. iv. 19; xx. 29; with *b*, iv. 10 sq., iii. 2.

Ver. 32. With *a* compare xiv. 29.—**And he that ruleth his spirit than he that taketh a city.** רוּחַ here not merely the spirit or the soul, but the *temper*, the passionate movement and excitement of the spirit. Comp. *Pirke Aboth* cap. iv. 1, where the question, Who is after all the true hero? is answered by a reference to the proverb of Solomon now before us. The Lord, moreover, in Matth. v. 5, promises to the meek that they shall inherit the earth.

Ver. 33. **The lot is cast into the lap**. Hitzig: "In the bosom the lot is shaken," a rendering which does indeed conform more closely to the import of חֵיק, "the bosom of the clothing," but to us who are not Orientals gives a meaning easily misunderstood. For we are wont to call the doubled or folded front of the dress the "lap."—**But from Jehovah is** (cometh) **all its decision**, the final judicial sense as it were, ("judgment," comp. Numb. xxvii. 21) in which the result of the lot is reached. Comp. xviii. 18, where, however, the discourse is specifically limited to the settling of judicial disputes by lot, while here attention is evidently directed to lots in general (and therefore to cases like Josh. vii. 19; 1 Sam. xiv. 37 sq., Numb. xvi. 8; Ps. xxii. 18 (19), *etc.*)

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

A course of thought running with any unity through the entire chapter it is here again impossible to detect. Only small groups of connected proverbs stand forth here and there from the general level; *e. g.*, vers. 1-3, vers. 10-15, vers. 27-30 (comp. especially the remarks on vers. 27 sq.). Hitzig's endeavor to develop here and in the two following chapters (*i. e.*, in general terms throughout the section xv. 33—xix. 2), symmetrically constructed groups of eight verses each, is quite as unsuccessful as his similar assumptions in respect to the construction of the general division, chap. x.—xxii. 16, on definite numerical principles (comp. above, remarks on x. 1 sq.; and on xiii. 1).

A decided pre-eminence belongs in the chapter, as it is now defined, to the idea that *God controls the action of man altogether according to His own wise judgment and good pleasure.* That "man proposes but God disposes,"—this truth which summons to humble confidence in God, and a childlike and unconditional surrender to the fatherly guidance of the Lord's hand, stands at the head of the section as a whole (ver. 1), with a special emphasizing of the divine influence exerted over the manner and the results of human speech. It recurs again in vers. 10–15 before the connected delineation of the authority of human kings, as counterparts and representatives of the great King of heaven; and here there is special reference not to the speech but to the action of men (ver. 9). Finally it forms the conclusion of the chapter, and that in the form of a reference to the supreme control which God holds in His hand over the lot as any where employed by men (ver. 33). It is the doctrine of the divine government of the world (the *gubernatio*, with its four prominent forms or methods, *permissio*, *impeditio*, *directio* and *determinatio*); or again the doctrine of the divine co-operation with the free self-determined acts of men (the *concursus* as it exists *tam ad bonas quam ad malas actiones hominum* [with reference both to the good and to the evil actions of men]), that is asserted in these propositions and developed in various directions. Especially does the intermediate place which human kings and judges assume as representatives of the divine justice, and in a certain sense prophets of the divine will (ver. 10), also as typically gods on earth (ver. 13-15; comp. Ps. lxxxii. 6), in their relation to the destiny of individual men, stand out in a significant prominence; it thus affords instructive premonition of the exhortations of the New Testament to obedience to the magistrates who stand in God's place,—such as are found in Matth. xxii. 21; Rom. xiii. 1 sq.; 1 Pet. ii. 17, *etc.* Compare what Melanchthon observes on ver. 10 sq.; "These words affirm that the whole political order, magistrates, laws, distinctions in authority, contracts, judgments, penalties are works ordained by the wisdom of God within the human race. Therefore since we know that political order is God's work, let us love it, and seek to maintain it by our duty, and in modesty obey it for God's sake, and let us render thanks to God the preserver, and let us know that the madness of devils and of men who disturb the political order is displeasing to God, *etc.*"

Other ethical truths to which a significant prominence is given are contained particularly in

Ver. 6. A reference to the fear of God, and penitent and believing consecration to God as the only way to the development of genuine fruits of love and of righteousness (see notes on this passage).

Ver. 20. Combined view of the two chief requisites to a really devout life; 1) obedience to the word of God, and 2) inspiring confidence in God.

Vers. 21 and 23 (comp. also ver. 24). The stress laid on the great value of an eloquent mouth, as an appropriate organ for a wise heart exercising itself in the service of the Lord.

Ver. 32. Reference to gentleness of spirit and the ruling of one's own passions, as the best and surest means to the attainment of real power and greatness—an expressive Biblical testimony against all uncharitable advancement of self in the way of strife, and against the combative spirit of brawlers and duellists.

[Andrew Fuller: The doctrine of verse 7 stands in apparent contradiction with 2 Tim. iii. 12. The truth seems to be that neither of the passages is to be taken *universally*. The peace possessed by those who please God does not extend so far as to exempt them from having ene-

Digitized by Google

mies, and though all godly men must in some form or other be persecuted, yet none are persecuted at all times. The passage from Timothy may therefore refer to the native enmity which true godliness is certain to excite, and the proverb to the Divine control over it.]

HOMILETIC AND PRACTICAL.

Homily on the chapter as a whole; Of God's wise and righteous government of the world, as it is exhibited 1) in the life of men in general (1-9); 2) in the action and administration of earthly rulers (10-15); 3) in the endeavors and results of human wisdom (16-26); 4) in the righteous retribution which awaits both, the good and the evil (27-33).—STÖCKER: On God's gracious care for men. 1) *Proof* that such a paternally upholding and governing providence of God over men exists, *a*) in general (vers. 1-9); *b*) through the government of the world in particular (10-15). 2) The duties of the pious in recognition of this paternal providence and government of God (vers. 16-33).—WOHLFARTH:—On the providence and government of God, and man's duty. Man proposes, God disposes,—usually otherwise than we devise and desire, but always more gloriously and better than we could do. Hence humility, prudence and trust in God are the chief duties of man in return.

Vers. 1-3. MELANCHTHON:—It is well to consider that our resolves are a different thing from their success. That we may form successful and salutary resolutions we need God's aid in two forms; in examining the different possible ways, and then in conforming our course to them. We must therefore at all times be of this firm purpose, to let our whole life be ruled by God's word, and for all things to invoke God's help.—GEIER (on ver. 1): Teachers, preachers and rulers especially must call earnestly on God for the careful government and sanctification of their tongue, in order that in the fulfilment whether of their public or their private duties the right word may always stand at their command, and nothing unseemly or injurious may escape them.—(On ver. 3): The duties of our calling we must indeed fulfil with fidelity and diligence, but yet in all patience await from the Lord blessing and success.—*Berleb. Bible:* If one is not able without God to utter a word that one has already conceived, how much less will one be able to bring any thing to pass without God's aid. And how much more will this be true within the sphere of the spiritual life, since man is wholly "insufficient of himself to think any thing as of himself" (2 Cor. iii. 5), but must receive all from the Lord, *etc.*—[ARNOT (on ver. 2): The human heart is beyond conception cunning in making that appear right which is felt pleasant. The real motive power that keeps the wheels of life going round is this: men like the things that they do, and do the things that they like.]

Vers. 4-9. *Würt. Bible* (on ver. 4): God's providence extends over good and wicked men (Matth. v. 45); through His ordaining it comes to pass that the ungodly are punished in their time and as they deserve.—VON GERLACH (on ver. 4): The wicked man also fulfils God's design, when the day of calamity comes upon him; all without exception must serve Him.—[CHARNOCK (on ver. 4): If sin ends in any good, it is only from that Infinite transcendency of skill that can bring good out of evil, as well as light out of darkness.—WATERLAND (on ver. 4): God bridles the wicked by laws and government and by the incessant labors of good men; and yet more immediately by His secret power over their hearts and wills, and over all their faculties; as well as over all occurrences and all second causes through the whole universe; and if He still affords them compass enough to range in, yet notwithstanding He rules over them with so strong and steady a hand, that they cannot move a step but by His leave, nor do a single act but what shall be turned to good effect.—BEVERIDGE (on ver. 4): God in His revelations hath told us nothing of the second causes which He hath established under Himself for the production of ordinary effects, that we may not perplex ourselves about them, but always look up to Him as the first cause, as working without them or by them as He sees good. But He hath told us plainly of the final cause or end of all things, that we may keep our eyes always fixed on that, and accordingly strive all we can to promote it.—Bp. HALL (on ver. 6): It is not an outward sacrifice that God regards in His remission of the punishment of our sin; but when He finds mercy to the poor, and uprightness of heart towards Himself and men, then He is graciously pleased to forbear His judgments; inasmuch as these graces, being wrought in us by His Spirit, cannot but proceed from a true faith whereby our sins are purged.—BONAR (on ver. 6): Forgiveness, ascertained forgiveness, conscious forgiveness, this is the beginning of all true fear. This expels a world of evil from the human heart and keeps it from re-entrance. It works itself out in such things as these—obedience, fellowship, love, zeal].—STARKE (on ver. 6): Not of merit but of grace are the sins of the penitent forgiven for Christ's sake. One of the chief fruits of justification is, however, the exhibition of fidelity and truth towards one's neighbors (Eph. ii. 8, 9; iv. 25).—(On ver. 7): Think not that thou wilt thyself subdue and overcome thine enemies, but only seek to have God for thy friend; He can of all thy foes make thee friends.—[BATES (on ver. 7): Many sins are committed for the fear of the anger of men, and presumption of the mercy of God; but it is often found that a religious constancy gains more friends than carnal obsequiousness.—TRAPP (on ver. 7): When God is displeased, all His creatures are up in arms to fetch in His rebels, and to do execution. At peace with Him, at peace with the creature too, that gladly takes His part, and is at His beck and check].—ZELTNER (on ver. 9): Be presumptuous in none of thy schemes, but thinking of thine own weakness put as the foundation of every undertaking "if the Lord will" (James iv. 15).—[ARNOT (on ver. 9): The desires of human hearts and the efforts of human hands go into the processes of providence and constitute the material on which the Almighty works.]

Vers. 10-15. MELANCHTHON; comp. Doctrinal and Ethical notes.—STARKE (on ver. 10): For the right conduct of the office of ruler and

judge it is not enough to understand well secular laws and rights; Divine wisdom is also absolutely essential.—(On ver. 12): Kings are not only not to do evil, or to let it be done by others with impunity; they are to hate and abhor it with all energy.—VON GERLACH (on ver. 11): Weight and measure as the invisible and spiritual means by which material possessions are estimated and determined for men according to their value, are holy to the Lord, a copy of His law in the outer world; taken up by Himself into His sanctuary, and therefore, as His work, to be regarded holy also by men.—(On ver. 14): Seasonable words of a wise man can easily avert the wrath of kings, destructive as that is. Therefore let each one mould himself into such a wise man, or find for himself such a one.

Vers. 16-26. [CHALMERS (on ver. 17): The reflex influence of the outward walk and way on the inner man.—ARNOT (on ver. 17): Doctrine, although both true and Divine, is for us only a shadow, if it be not embodied in holiness.—WATERLAND (on ver. 18): Shame and contempt the end of pride, *a*) by natural tendency; *b*) because of God's detestation and resolution to punish it.—MUFFET (on ver. 19): It is a pleasant thing to be enriched with other men's goods: it is a gainful thing to have part of the prey: it is a glorious thing to divide the spoil. It is better to be injured than to do injury; it is better to be patient than to be insolent; it is better with the afflicted people of God to be bruised in heart and low of port, than to enjoy the pleasures or treasures of sin or of this world for a season.—TRAPP (on ver. 20): He that, in the use of lawful means resteth upon God for direction and success, though he fail of his design, yet he knows whom he hath trusted, and God will "know his soul in adversity"].—GEIER (on ver. 20): In doubtful cases to hold fast to God's word and believingly hope in His help, ensures always a good issue.—STARKE (on vers. 21, 22): Eloquence combined with wisdom is to be regarded as an excellent gift of God, and produces so much the more edification and profit.—LANGE (on ver. 21): One must first learn to think rightly before he can speak well.—VON GERLACH (on ver. 26): Since that which causes us labor and trouble becomes a means of our subsistence, it in turn helps us overcome labor and trouble, for this very thing, by virtue of God's wise, regulating providence, becomes for us a spur to industry.—[LAWSON (on ver. 26): Self-love is a damning sin where it reigns as the chief principle of action; but the want of self-love where it is required is no less criminal.]

Vers. 27-33. STARKE (on vers. 27 sq.): The lack of genuine love for one's neighbor is the source of all deception, persecution and slander of the innocent.—Hypocrites can indeed by an assumed mien of holiness deceive men, but before the eyes of God all this is clear and open, to their shame.—(On ver. 32): The greatest heroes and conquerors of the world are often just the most miserable slaves of their lusts.—E. LÖSCH (on ver. 31—see *Sonntagsfeier*, 1841, No. 27): Age, its burdens, its dignities; means to the attainment of a happy old age.—SAURIN (Sermon on ver. 32): On true heroism—what it is, 1) to be ruler of one's spirit; 2) to gain cities and lands.—VON GERLACH (on ver. 33): Chance there is not, and man can never give more than the outward occasion for the decision, which lies wholly in the hand of the Lord.—[TRAPP (on ver. 30): Wicked men are great students. . . . Their wits will better serve them to find out a hundred shifts or carnal arguments than to yield to one saving truth, though never so much cleared up to them.—MUFFET (on ver. 31): Commendable old age leaneth upon two staves—the one the remembrance of a life well led, the other the hope of eternal life.—See EMMONS' Sermon on ver. 31.—J. EDWARDS (on ver. 32): The strength of the good soldier of Jesus Christ appears in nothing more than in steadfastly maintaining the holy, calm meekness, sweetness and benevolence of his mind, amidst all the storms, injuries, strange behaviour, and surprising acts and events, of this evil and unreasonable world.—LAWSON (on ver. 32): The meek obtain the noblest victories and enjoy the happiest kind of authority.—SOUTH (on ver. 33): Sermon on "All contingencies under the direction of God's providence."]

β) **Admonition to contentment and a peaceable disposition.**

CHAP. XVII.

1 Better a dry morsel and quietness therewith
than a house full of slain beasts with strife.
2 A wise servant shall have rule over a degenerate son,
and shall have part of the inheritance among the brethren.
3 The fining pot is for silver, and the furnace for gold,
but he that trieth hearts is Jehovah.
4 Wickedness giveth heed to lying lips,
deceit giveth ear to a vile tongue.

Digitized by Google

5 He that mocketh the poor hath reproached his Maker,
he that rejoiceth over a calamity shall not be unpunished.
6 The crown of the old is children's children,
the glory of children is their parents.
7 High speech doth not become the fool,
how much less do lying lips the noble!
8 As a precious stone is a gift in the eyes of him that receiveth it,
whithersoever it turneth it maketh prosperous.
9 He that covereth trangression seeketh after love;
but he that repeateth a matter estrangeth friends.
10 A reproof sinketh deeper into a wise man
than to chastise a fool an hundred times.
11 The rebellious seeketh only evil,
and a cruel messenger shall be sent after him.
12 Meet a bear robbed of her whelps,
and not a fool in his folly.
13 He that returneth evil for good,
from his house evil shall not depart.
14 As a breaking forth of waters is the beginning of strife;
before the strife poureth forth, cease!
15 He that acquitteth the wicked and he that condemneth the just,
an abomination to Jehovah are they both.
16 Why this price in the hand of a fool?
(It is) to get wisdom, and he hath no heart to it.
17 At all times the friend loveth,
but the brother is born of adversity.
18 A man void of understanding is he who striketh hands,
who becometh surety in the presence of his friend.
19 He loveth sin that loveth strife,
and he that buildeth high his doors seeketh destruction.
20 He that is of a false heart findeth no good,
he that goeth astray with his tongue falleth into evil.
21 He that begetteth a fool doeth it to his sorrow,
and the father of a fool hath no joy.
22 A joyous heart promoteth health,
but a broken spirit drieth the bones.
23 A gift from the bosom a wicked man will receive
to pervert the ways of justice.
24 Before the face of the wise is wisdom,
but the fool's eyes are in the ends of the earth.
25 A grief to his father is a foolish son,
and a trouble to her that bare him.
26 Also to punish the righteous is not good,
to smite the noble contrary to right.
27 He that spareth his words hath knowledge,
and he that is quiet in temper is a man of understanding.
28 Even a fool who keepeth silence will be counted wise,
and he that shutteth his lips is wise.

GRAMMATICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 4.—מֵרַע is probably not a Hiph. part.: "a wicked man," but an abstract substantive, as the parallel term שֶׁקֶר indicates (Ewald, Hitzig); and מֵזִין stands, according to the parallel מַקְשִׁיב for מַאֲזִין. [Bött. insists upon regarding the form as a Hiph. part. masc., distinguished by the vocalization from מֵרֵעַ "friend" (see §§1124, A; 764, c); Fuerst gives to the full form מֵרֵעַ, which never occurs, but is assumed as the singular of מְרֵעִים, the active signification "*maleficus*," evil doer, but maintains that מֵרַע, which occurs only here except with a pausal modification, has naturally the neuter abstract meaning. See also Green, §140, 5.—A.]

Ver. 10.—From the infin. הַכּוֹת there is easily supplied as an object מַכָּה.—תֵּחַת is the Imperf. of the verb נָחַת, to descend, to penetrate (comp. Is. xxx. 30): the form without abbreviation would, according to Ps. xxxviii. 3, have

been הֲגוּת. [So Bött. who also defends the position of the accent on the ground of emphasis (§ 497, 3), and criticizes, both on the ground of specific form and general construction, Fuerst's assigning it as an apoc. Imperf. to חָתָה.—A.]

Ver 11.—That רָע is the subject of the clause, and not possibly מְרִי, as the Syr., Chald., Umbreit, Ewald, *etc.*, maintain, appears from the position of אַךְ before the latter word, and also from the unquestionable reference of the בּוֹ in the 2d clause to רָע as a masculine substantive. [Rueetschi (as above, p. 146) replies that אַךְ may as well throw its emphasis on an entire proposition as on a single word (see Nordheimer, § 1072, 4) and that בּוֹ refers to מְרִי the subject of the proposition, which is an abstract in the sense of a concrete. Versions and interpreters are very equally divided; with our author emphasizing מְרִי as object, "only rebellion, nothing but rebellion," are the E. V., V. Ess, Bertheau, K., S.; with Rueetschi are De W., M., N., and substantially H. and W. We render with the latter in opposition to Zöckler's view.—A.].

Ver. 13. The K'thibh לֹא־תָמִישׁ is to be retained, since the Hiphil הֵמִישׁ has in Ps. lv. 12 also the intransitive meaning "depart.'

Vers. 19. Aben Ezra, Geier, Schultens, *etc.*, take the expression "to make high the door, or gate," as meaning "to open wide the mouth, to utter a vehement outcry" (פֶּתַח being taken as equivalent to פֶּה, as *ostium* is to *os*; comp. Ps. cxli. 3; Eccles. xii. 4). But the idea would then be very obscurely expressed, and instead of מַגְבִּיהַּ we should expect מַגְדִּיל.

Vers. 22. גֵּהָה is not equivalent to גֵּוָה or גְּוִיָּה, "body," (Chald., Syr., Bertheau, *etc.*) but is to be derived from the radical גָּהָה, Hos. v. 13,—and therefore means "healing, recovery" (Hitzig, "the closing up of a wound"?) [Fuerst prefers the rendering of the Targ., Syr., *etc.*; Gesen. that adopted by the author.—A.].

Ver. 27. The rendering which we give conforms to the K'thibh, וְקַר רוּחַ, to substitute for which with the K'ri (which is followed by the Vulg., Luther, *etc.*) יְקַר רוּחַ, "of a noble spirit," seems here less appropriate. [The LXX follow the K'thibh].

EXEGETICAL.

1. Vers. 1-9. Admonitions to contentment and a wise moderation in earthly possessions, and in the use of the tongue.—**Better a dry morsel and quietness therewith.** "A dry piece of bread," without wine, without even vinegar (Ruth ii. 14) or water with it (1 Sam. xxv. 11). The thing contrasted with it is זְבָחִים, not "sacrificial banquets" (Umbreit, Elster, [Fuerst]), but animals slaughtered for sacrifice, as constituting the chief element in a rich, sumptuous meal; comp. chap. ix. 2; Gen. xliii. 16. For the general meaning compare xv. 16, 17; xvi. 8.

Ver. 2. **A wise servant** (comp. xiv. 35) **shall have rule over a degenerate son,** lit., "a bad, unprofitable son," who becomes impoverished and even a slave, because he has squandered his means, *etc.*—**Among the brethren shall he divide the inheritance,** *i. e.* among brethren who are sons of the testator, while he himself who inherits with them, is not a son but only a servant. Comp. Abraham's apprehension in regard to his servant Eliezer, Gen. xv. 3 sq. With this expression "in the midst of the brethren" compare a similar one in Hos. xiii. 15.—Ver. 3. With clause *a* compare xxvii. 21 *a* (which is literally identical): with *b* compare xv. 11; xvi. 2; xxi. 2; xxiv. 12.

Ver. 4. **Wickedness giveth heed to lying lips.** See critical notes. The meaning is plainly this: "A wicked heart, inwardly corrupt, gladly attends to lying talk; and deceit"—so clause *b* asserts in addition—*i. e.* a heart full of inward insincerity and hypocrisy, a hypocritical man given to lying (abstract for concrete), "hearkens to a perverse tongue," *i. e.* finds pleasure in wicked discourse, which supplies words to its own base thoughts, and develops them into definite evil propositions and designs.

Ver. 5. With *a* compare xiv. 31.—**He that rejoiceth over a calamity shall not be unpunished** (comp. xi. 21; xvi. 5). "Sudden misfortune," according to clause *a* probably sudden poverty. Comp. Job xxxi. 29, a similar utterance regarding the penal desert of an uncharitable delight in calamity.

Ver. 6. With clause *a* comp. Ps. cxxvii. 5.—**The glory of children is their fathers.** As the pride and honor of the gray-headed is the family circle that surrounds them, or the advancing series of their children, grandchildren, *etc.*, so "on their part children, so long as they are not also parents, can only reach backward; and with the genealogy, the farther back it reaches, the honor of the family increases" (Hitzig).

Ver. 7. **High speech doth not become the fool.** "A lip of excess, of prominence" plainly denotes an assuming, imperious style of speech,—not the "elevated, or soaring," as Ewald, Elster, Umbreit claim; for the parallel "lip of deceit" in clause *b* indicates its sinful character.—**How much less do lying lips the noble?** "The noble," the spirit of lofty dispositions (comp. ver. 26),—to whom deceitfulness, and crafty, sly artifices of speech are less becoming than to any other man,—stands contrasted with the "fool" just as in Isa. xxxii. 5 sq.

Ver. 8. **As a precious stone is a gift in the eyes of him that receiveth it.** Lit., "a stone of loveliness," a costly stone, *gemma gratissima* (Vulg.); comp. i. 9.—The "master" of the gift is here evidently not its giver (Elster, comp. Luther, and many of the older expositors), but he that receives it, he who is won by it; and the "gift" is here to be taken not in the bad sense, of bribery (as below in ver. 23), but rather of lawful presents; comp. xviii. 16.—**Whithersoever it turneth it maketh prosperous;** *i. e.* to whomsoever it may come it will have a good result and secure for its giver supporters and friends. The expression conforms to the idea of the "precious stone" in clause *a* (although it is not the jewel, but the gift that is subject of the verb "turneth"). For a really beautiful and well-cut stone sparkles, whichever

Digitized by Google

way one may turn it, and from whichever side one may view it; just so is it with the good result of a well-directed generosity, by which the hearts of all are necessarily won. A truth which naturally is to be taken quite in a relative and conditional sense.

Ver. 9. **He that covereth transgression seeketh after love,** *i. e.* not "seeks to gain the love of others" but "seeks to exercise love, a truly charitable spirit" (so HITZIG with undoubted correctness, in opposition to BERTHEAU). [BRIDGES and M. also take this view, which commends itself both as the deepest and the most disinterested representation.—A.]. For the "covering transgression" comp. x. 12, and the remarks on the passage.—**But he that repeateth a matter separateth friends** (see xvi. 28). "Repeateth a matter" (שֹׁנֶה בְדָבָר) is not "to return with remarks" or "with a word" [*i. e.* to repeat] (EWALD, BERTHEAU, ELSTER, FUERST, *etc.*), but "to come back with a matter," [GESEN.] *i. e.* to be continually reverting to something, repeatedly to bring it up and show it forth, instead of letting it alone and covering it with the mantle of charity. This expression is different both from the Latin, "*ad alios deferre, denuntiare*" (WINER) and also from the Greek δευτεροῦν λόγον. Comp. furthermore Ecclesiast. xix. 6-10.

2. Vers. 10-20. Admonitions to a peaceable spirit; warnings against a contentious and uncharitable disposition.—**A reproof sinketh deeper into a wise man than a hundred stripes into a fool,** (comp. Deut. xxv. 3); lit., "than to smite the fool with a hundred." With the meaning of the verse compare SALLUST's *Jugurtha*, c. 11: *altius in pectus descendit*, and the common phrase "to make a deeper impression."

Ver. 11. Clause *a*, see critical notes for the reasons for our departure from ZÖCKLER's rendering.—**And a cruel messenger shall be sent after him,** *i. e.* by God, against whom we are to regard the "rebellion" mentioned in clause *a* as directed. So the LXX and Vulg. rendered in their day, and among recent interpreters BERTHEAU, *e. g.;* for to think of a mere human messenger, as in xvi. 14, is forbidden by the analogy of passages like Ps. xxxv. 5, 6; lxxviii. 49; HITZIG's rendering, however, "and a cruel angel (a wild demon of passion, as it were), is let loose within him," is altogether artificial, and rests upon modern conceptions that are quite foreign to the Old Testament; besides we ought probably to have found בְּקִרְבּוֹ "in the midst of him," instead of בּוֹ.

Ver. 12. **Meet a bear robbed of her whelps.** The Infin. abs. here stands for the Imper. or Jussive; comp. Gen. xvii. 10; Deut. i. 16; Jer. ii. 2, *etc.* For the use of the epicene דֹּב for the she-bear comp. Hos. xiii. 8; 2 Sam. xvii. 8.—The "fool in his folly" is naturally a fool who is peculiarly malignant, one who is in a very paroxysm of folly, and whose raving is more dangerous than the madness of a wild beast. Comp. SCHILLER: "*Gefährlich ists den Leu zu wecken,*" *etc.* ['Tis perilous to wake the lion].

Ver. 13. With clause *a* compare 1 Sam. xxv. 21; with *b*, 2 Sam. iii. 29.—"Evil" here in the sense of misfortune, the penalty for acts of injustice done the good.

Ver. 14. **As a breaking forth of waters is the beginning of strife** [ZÖCKLER: "he letteth forth waters," *etc.* Z. also conceives of the latter part of the clause as meaning literally "who (lets loose) the beginning of strife;" in his view the participle is to be repeated before the word רֵאשִׁית "beginning." The use of the verb פטר in the sense of "send forth, bring out" is confirmed by the Targum on Ex. xxi. 26. The participle cannot, however, in Z.'s view, be taken here in a neuter sense, as EWALD maintains (so UMBREIT). FUERST maintains the view of E. and U. and cites analogous forms of verbal nouns. We adopt it as justified by verbal analogies and simplifying the construction.—A.] LUTHER expresses the substantial idea thus: "He who begins strife is like him that tears away the dam from the waters."—**Before the strife poureth forth, cease!** The meaning of the verb הִתְגַּלַּע which is best attested is here, as in xviii. 1; xx. 3, "to roll forth." Here, as in verse 8, the figurative conception employed in clause *a* influences the selection of the verb in *b*. The strife is conceived of as a flood which after its release rolls on irresistibly. UMBREIT, ELSTER, *etc.*, following the Chald. and Arabic, explain "before the strife becomes warm;" HITZIG (and EWALD also) "before the strife shows its teeth." As though an altogether new figure could be so suddenly introduced here, whether it be that of a fire blazing up, or that of a lion showing his teeth! [As the word occurs but three times, and the cognate roots in the Hebrew and its sister languages are not decisive, the moral argument may well turn the scale; and this certainly favors the view in which Z. has the concurrence of FUERST, BERTHEAU, STUART, *etc.*—A.]

Ver. 15. Comp. xxiv. 24; Isa. v. 23.—**An abomination to Jehovah are they both;** lit., "an abhorrence of Jehovah are also they two;" comp. 2 Sam. xix. 31, where גַּם, also, expresses as it does here the associating of a second with the one.

Ver. 16. **Why this price in the hand of a fool,** *etc.* [While there is no essential disagreement among expositors in regard to the general meaning of the verse, they are divided as to the punctuation and the mutual relation of the clauses. The Hebrew points are not decisive. Z. agrees with the Vulg., E. V., H., S., *etc.* in making the sentence one complex interrogative sentence. DE DIEU, SCHULTENS, VAN ESS, DE WETTE, NOYES, *etc.*, make two interrogative clauses, followed by one affirmation. We have chosen the more equal division of the LXX.—A.] The getting or buying of wisdom is by no means a thing absolutely impossible, as appears from chap. iv. 5, where express admonition is given to do this. But for earthly gold, for a price, it is not for sale, and especially not for the fool, who has no understanding. For the last clause, "and heart, understanding, is not, does not exist," compare the substantially equivalent expression in Ps. xxxii. 9; also Jer. v. 21, *etc.*

Digitized by Google

Ver. 17. Compare xviii. 24; also Ecclesiast. xii. 7.—**But the brother is born of adversity.** The ideas "friend" and "brother" are related the one as the climax of the other. The "friend," the companion with whom one preserves a friendly intercourse cherishes a constant good-will toward his comrade; but it is only necessity that develops him further into a "brother," as it gives the opportunity to attest his loving disposition by offerings of love, such as in truth only one brother makes for another. Comp. ENNIUS, in CIC. *Lœl. c.* 17: *Amicus certus in re incerta cernitur;* and also the Arabic proverb (Sent. 53 in ERPENIUS *Gramm.*): "The friend one finds out not till one needs him."—יֻלָּד "he is born," as a new being, into the new conditions of the actual, brotherly relation. לְצָרָה must here mean "of adversity" (HITZIG, K.), not "in adversity" (UMBREIT, N.), or "for adversity" (EWALD, BERTHEAU, ELSTER, DE W., S., M., *etc.*). [The grammatical justification of Z.'s view is found mainly in the fact that לְ is ordinarily used when in a passive construction the efficient cause is to be expressed: see GESEN. *Lehrgeb.* § 221, ROD. GESEN. *Heb. Gram.* § 140. 2. Of course it may also denote the final cause. —A.]—For ver. 18 compare vi. 1-5; xi. 15.

Ver. 19. With clause *a* compare James i. 20; with *b*, Prov. xvi. 18.—**Who buildeth high his doors**; *i. e.* seeks to transform his simple residence into a proud and splendid edifice, but by that very process only hastens its "destruction" (lit., "shattering, downfall," comp. the similar term in x. 14, *etc.*). [SHARPE'S *Texts of Bible explained, etc.*: "Private houses were sometimes built ostentatiously with a lofty gateway which would naturally breed jealousy in the neighbors, and invite the visits of the tax-gatherer; and in a time when law was weak and property very unsafe, might easily lead to the ruin of its owner."—A.] The sentiment is therefore directed against pride as the chief source of a quarrelsome spirit, and the most common cause of ruinous contention.

Ver. 20. With clause *a* compare xi. 20; xvi. 20.—**He that wandereth with his tongue,** *i. e.* speaks now this way, now that; therefore has a deceitful tongue, "a wayward tongue," x. 31 (comp. viii. 13).—**Falleth into evil**; see xiii. 17. Observe the climax existing in the negative expression "no good" in *a*, and this "evil."

3. Vers. 21-28. Proverbs of various content, directed especially against want of sense, and loquacity.—**He that begetteth a fool doeth it to his own sorrow.** Comp. x. 1; xviii. 13; and the converse of the thought here presented, chap. xxiii. 24; also xv. 20.

Ver. 22. **A joyous heart promoteth health.** See critical note. For the sentiment comp. xv. 13; with clause *b* in particular, iii. 8.

Ver. 23. **A gift from the bosom a wicked man will receive.** "From the bosom," *i. e.* secretly and stealthily; comp. xxi. 14. The term "gift" is here used naturally of unlawful bribery.—With clause *b* compare xviii. 5; Am. ii. 7.

Ver. 24. **Before the face of the wise is wisdom.** "Before the face," here it would seem "very near" and therefore "close before the face" (BERTHEAU, ELSTER, *etc.*): or again with ZIEGLER, HITZIG, *etc.*, the explanation may be in accordance with Deut. xvi. 16, "Wisdom floats before the man of understanding, he has it in his eye" (comp. xv. 14).—**But the eyes of the fool** (range) **to the end of the earth,** *i. e.* "his mind is not on the subject, but roams in undefined, shadowy distance" (HITZIG); he thinks of many and various things, on every possible thing,—only not of the very thing that is needful and important; comp. iv. 25.—Ver. 25. Comp. ver. 21 and x. 1.

Ver. 26. **Also to punish the righteous is not good, to smite the noble contrary to right.** The also (גַּם) plainly gives prominence to the verb that immediately follows, and this verb should be allowed to retain its ordinary signification, "to punish with a fine, to impose a pecuniary fine" (comp. xxii. 3). The fine as a comparatively light penalty, which may easily at one time or another fall with a certain justice even on a "just" man (*e. g.* when he from inadvertence has in some way injured the property of another), stands contrasted with the much severer punishment with stripes; and as these two verbal ideas are related, so are also the predicates "not good" (comp. ver. 20), and "contrary to right" (above desert, beyond all proportion to the just and reasonable), in the relation of a climax. On the other hand the "righteous" and the "noble" (as in ver. 7) are essentially persons of the same class. The proverb, which evidently contains an admonition to mild and reasonable treatment of upright men, or a warning against the inhuman enforcement of penal laws upon active and meritorious citizens, has been in many ways misunderstood and falsely applied; and this is true of most of the recent expositors with the exception of UMBREIT, who alone interprets with entire correctness. (BERTHEAU and ELSTER are also essentially right, except that they do not take the עַל־יֹשֶׁר "contrary to right" as the predicate, but are disposed to connect it by way of more exact definition with the phrase "to smite the noble"). [The LXX, Vulg., followed by the E. V., W., M., H., N., render "for their equity." S. and K. agree with Z., both in the meaning and the predicative construction.—A.]

Ver. 27. With *a* comp. x. 19.—**And he that is of a quiet temper.** Comp. the opposite of the "coolness of spirit" here intended (*i. e.* cautious, moderate, quietly considerate deportment); Ps. xxxix. 3 (4).—Ver. 28. Comp. Job xiii. 5; Prov. x. 19, *etc.*

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

The introductory verse with its commendation of contentment and a peaceable spirit at the same time, or of contentment as the source and basis of a peaceable disposition and conduct, may be regarded as a prefatory announcement of the main subject of the chapter. Contentment is furthermore commended (at least indirectly) in vers. 2, 5, 8, 16, 19, 22-24; a peaceable and forbearing disposition in vers. 4, 9-15, 17, 19, 20,

Digitized by Google

26.—The summons which comes out in the opening verses, 1-9, to combine with contentment the appropriate restraint and regulation of the tongue,—or *to be abstemious not merely with the mouth but with the tongue* (by truthfulness and gentleness in speech, and by a taciturn disposition, ver. 28),—recurs again in the last two verses. It may therefore to a certain extent be regarded as in general the fundamental idea of the entire section. In the asceticism of the early Church and of the monasticism of the middle ages, this idea that there must be an inward organic coexistence of bodily and spiritual fasting, or that one should bring the tongue under a serious and strict discipline, as *the organ not merely of taste, but also of speech*, found as is well known only too prolific practical appreciation. For, appealing to the supposed model of Christ's forty days of fasting in the wilderness, men added to the injunctions of fasting unnaturally strict prescriptions of silence in many forms (see my "Critical History of Asceticism," pp. 297 sq.). Apart from these extravagances and exaggerations, the organic connection, and living reciprocity of influence between the activity of the tongue as an organ of taste and an organ of speech, such as exists in every man, is a matter deserving distinct recognition; and sins of the tongue in both directions must be with all earnestness shunned, and together subdued and destroyed (comp. James iii. 22).

Other ethical sentiments of special value and compass are found in ver. 4: the heavy guilt not only of the tempter, but also of the tempted, who, on account of his inward corruption and vileness, gives a ready hearing to the evil solicitations of the former; comp. James i. 14 sq.—Ver. 6. The blessing of a consecrated domestic life, as it shows itself in both the parents and their posterity, in their mutual relations and demeanor. The opposite of this appears in vers. 21, 25.

Ver. 16. The pricelessness of true wisdom, and the worthlessness of earthly possessions and treasures in the hand of a fool.

Ver. 17. The great worth of a true friend in time of need.

Ver. 26. The necessity of a mild, considerate bearing on the part of persons in judicial and magisterial station, toward deserving citizens of the state, in cases where they have perchance gone astray or come short of duty. Comp. the exegetical remarks on this passage.

[Lawson, ver. 4: "Wicked men have a great treasure of evil in their hearts, and yet have not enough to satisfy their own corrupt dispositions.

Ver. 15. Justifying the wicked has an appearance of mercy in it, but there is cruelty to millions in unreasonable acts of mercy to individuals.—Ministers are guilty of the sin of condemning the righteous when they preach doctrines unscripturally rigid, making those things to be sinful which are not condemned in the word of God, or carrying the marks necessary to discover grace to a pitch too high to suit the generality of true Christians, or applying to particular persons those terrors that do not justly belong to them. Such was the fault of Job's friends."]

HOMILETIC AND PRACTICAL.

Homily on the entire chapter: A peaceable spirit and contentment as the sum of all wisdom; its opposite (contentiousness and foolish aspiring after things that are high, see especially ver. 19) as the source of all failure in things temporal as well as spiritual.—Stöcker: Of true temperance in controlling all unseasonable debate and strife; 1) the causes of these last (vers. 4-13); 2) the most important means of averting them (14-19); 3) the serious injuries and disadvantages which grow out of them (20-28).

Vers. 1-8. Hasius (on ver. 2): To attain to power and influence in this world more depends on understanding and prudence than on birth and outward advantages.—Lange (on ver. 3): All human investigations and theories concerning the interior world of thought in man are inconclusive and deceptive. The searching of the heart of man is one of the kingly prerogatives of God.—[Trapp (on ver. 3): God tries us that He may make us know what is in us, what dross, what pure metal; and all may see that we are such as, for a need, can "glorify Him in the very fires" (Is. xxiv. 15).—Bridges (on ver. 4): The listening ears share the responsibility of the naughty tongue.]—Zeltner (on ver. 4): According as the heart and disposition of a man are moulded, he delights either in good or in evil discourse.—Wohlfarth (on ver. 7): Force not thyself above, degrade not thyself below thy condition.—Von Gerlach (on ver. 7): The outward and the inward must always be in harmony, else a distorted and repulsive display results. As the fool cannot fitly speak of high things, so senseless must a falsehood appear to the noble.—Lange (on ver. 8): Though one may effect much with an unjust judge by presents, how much better will it be if thou bringest thine heart to the Lord thy God as a gift and offering!

Vers. 9-15. [Lord Bacon (on ver. 9): There are two ways of making peace and reconciling differences; the one begins with amnesty, the other with a recital of injuries, combined with apologies and excuses. Now I remember that it was the opinion of a very wise man and a great politician, that "he who negotiates a peace, without recapitulating the grounds of difference, rather deludes the minds of the parties by representing the sweetness of concord, than reconciles them by equitable adjustment." But Solomon, a wiser man than he, is of a contrary opinion, approving of amnesty and forbidding recapitulation of the past. For in it are these disadvantages: it is as the chafing of a sore; it creates the risk of a new quarrel (for the parties will never agree as to the proportions of injuries on either side); and, lastly, it brings it to a matter of apologies; whereas either party would rather be thought to have forgiven an injury than to have accepted an excuse.]—Melanchthon (on vers. 9-12): As the monitor must show sincerity and love of truth, and guard against a slanderous love of censure, so in him who is admonished, there is becoming a readiness to be instructed, and both must keep themselves free from φιλονεικία, from an ambitious quarrelsomeness.—Cramer (on ver. 10): To him who is of a

Digitized by Google

noble sort words of rebuke are more grievous than blows, and he yields to the discipline of mere words.—STARKE (on ver. 13): If God sharply punishes ingratitude, from this it is also evident how dear to Him, on the other hand, thankfulness must be.—(On ver 14): From a little spark a great fire may arise (James iii. 5); but he who buries in the ashes the kindling contention may thereby avert a great disaster.—[TRAPP (on ver. 10): The fool is beaten, but not bent to goodness; amerced but not amended.—(On ver. 13): To render good for evil is Divine, good for good is human, evil for evil is brutish, evil for good is devilish.—BRIDGES (on ver. 15): If God *justifies the wicked*, it is on account of righteousness. If he *condemn the just*, it is on the imputation of unrighteousness. Nowhere throughout the universe do the moral perfections of the Governor of the world shine so gloriously as at the Cross of Calvary.]

Ver. 16-22. ZELTNER (on ver. 17): The most reliable and faithful friend, on whom one may depend most confidently in the very time of need, is the Lord Jesus. Strive for His friendship above all things, and thou hast treasure enough!—[ARNOT (on ver. 17): In the Scriptures we learn where the fountain of true friendship lies, what is its nature, why its flow is impeded now, and when it shall be all over like the waves of the sea. Our best friendship is due to our best friend. He deserves it and desires it. The heart of the man Christ Jesus yearns for the reciprocated love of saved men, and grieves when it is not given.].—STARKE (on ver. 19): He who first leaves room for one sin falls afterward into many others.—Contention and pride are almost always sisters, and of a most destructive sort.—VON GERLACH (on ver. 22): The heart, the fountain of life, works to bless the whole of man's condition when it is really sound, *i. e.*, when the grace of Jesus Christ has healed and renewed it.—[TRAPP (on ver. 22): When faith hath once healed the conscience, and grace hath hushed the affection, and composed all within, so that there is a Sabbath of spirit, and a blessed tranquility lodged in the soul; then the body also is vigorous and vigetous, for most part in very good plight and healthful constitution, which makes man's life very comfortable.—BRIDGES (on ver. 22): Liveliness needs a guard lest it should degenerate into levity; a grave temperament lest it should sink into morbid depression. Christian principle on both sides is the principle of enlarged happiness and steady consistency.]

Ver. 23-28. STARKE (on ver. 24): The more one gapes after vanity, the more foolish does the heart become.—(On ver. 25): A wise father has indeed now and then a foolish son; if he has not himself perchance deserved this, by neglect in education, let him bear his cross with patience.—(On ver. 26): He sins doubly who declares evil good, and besides visits the goodness of a righteous man with penalties.—*Berleburg Bible* (on vers. 27, 28): It is better to say nothing than foolish things.—VON GERLACH (on ver. 28): By silence a fool abates something of his senselessness, and since he gets the opportunity to collect himself and to reflect, a beginning of wisdom is developed in him.

γ) Admonition to affability, fidelity in friendship, and the other virtues of social life.

CHAP. XVIII.

1 He that separateth himself seeketh his own pleasure;
against all counsel doth he rush on.
2 A fool hath no delight in understanding,
but that his heart may reveal itself.
3 When wickedness cometh then cometh contempt,
and with shameful deeds reproach.
4 Deep waters are the words of man's mouth;
the fountain of wisdom is a flowing brook.
5 To have regard to the wicked is not good,
(nor) to oppress the righteous in judgment.
6 The lips of the fool engage in strife,
and his mouth calleth for stripes.
7 The mouth of the fool is his destruction,
and his lips are a snare to his soul.
8 The words of a slanderer are words of sport,
but they go down into the innermost parts of the body.
9 He also who is slothful in his work
is brother to the destroyer.

Digitized by Google

10 A strong tower is the name of Jehovah;
the righteous runneth to it and is safe.
11 The possessions of the rich are his strong city,
and as a high wall in his own conceit.
12 Before destruction the heart of man is haughty,
and before honor is humility.
13 He that answereth before he hath heard,
it is folly and shame to him.
14 The spirit of a man will sustain his infirmity,
but a wounded spirit—who can bear?
15 An understanding heart gaineth knowledge,
and the ear of the wise seeketh knowledge.
16 A man's gift maketh room for him,
and bringeth him before the great.
17 He that is first is righteous in his controversy;
then cometh his neighbor and searcheth him out.
18 The lot causeth contentions to cease,
and decideth between the mighty.
19 A brother resisteth more than a strong city,
and (such) contentions are as the bars of a palace.
20 With the fruit of a man's mouth shall his body be satisfied;
with the revenue of his lips shall he be filled.
21 Death and life are in the power of the tongue;
he that loveth it shall eat its fruit.
22 Whoso findeth a wife findeth a good thing,
and shall obtain favor of Jehovah.
23 The poor shall use entreaties,
and the rich will answer roughly.
24 A man of (many) friends will prove himself base,
but there is a friend that sticketh closer than a brother.

GRAMMATICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1.—It would perhaps be admissible with HITZIG (following the LXX and Vulg.) to exchange לְתַאֲוָה for the rarer לְתֹאֲנָה (Judg. xiv. 4), from which we should obtain the meaning "He that separateth himself seeketh after an *occasion* (of strife);" Vulg.: *Occasiones quærit, qui vult recedere ab amico.* For the use of בִּקֵּשׁ with בְּ see also Job x. 6. [The E. V. in the text understands the בְּ as indicating the condition, and so supplying the motive of the seeker; the reading of the margin is "according to his desire." H., N., S., M., *etc.*, agree with our author in connecting it with the object desired. The views of commentators, which are very diverse, may be found in considerable number in MUENSCHER, *in loco.*—A.]

Ver. 3.—Instead of רָשָׁע we shall be obliged, with J. D. MICHAELIS, HITZIG, UMBREIT, *etc.*, to point רֶשַׁע as the parallel קָלוֹן (*i. e.*, "infamy, infamous conduct," *turpitudo*) indicates.

Ver. 6.—[A masc. verb again with the fem. noun שִׂפְתֵי, as in ver. 2; x. 21, 32; xv. 7.—A.]

Ver. 10.—Without any necessity HITZIG proposes to read יָרוּם instead of יָרוּץ, and to translate "by it (the name of Jehovah) riseth up high." [RUEETSCHI (as above, p. 147) concurs in rejecting both HITZIG's emendation and his conception of the proposition. He justifies by examples like 1 Kings x. 26; 1 Sam xxv. 26; Joshua xxiii. 7, *etc.*, the use of בְּ after verbs of motion,—and suggests that the concluding participle marks the quick and sure result of the preceding act.—A.]

Ver. 17.—The K'ri' וּבָא; the K'thibh is perhaps more appropriately יָבֹא.

Ver. 19.—The LXX and Vulg. appear to have read נוֹשָׁע (βοηθούμενος, *adjuvatur*) instead of נִפְשָׁע; HITZIG proposes to read by emendation אֹחֵז פֶּשַׁע, "to shut out sin is better than a strong tower," *etc.*

Ver. 24.—לְהִתְרוֹעֵעַ, which is probably to be derived from the root רַע, רָעַע, and to be regarded as the reflexive of the Intensive form (comp. the Niphal form יֵרוֹעַ, chap. xi. 15), must have the copula הָיָה supplied to give a full verbal sense (comp. chap. xix. 8): it therefore means "is to prove himself base, serves for this, to show himself base (*i. e.*, here specifically an unworthy comrade, a bad friend)." The alliteration which is doubtless intentional between רֵעִים and הִתְרוֹעֵעַ led even the early translators (Syr., Chald., Vulg., and also THEODOT.) to derive the latter word from רָעָה, *associare*, and accordingly to explain it by "to make one's self a friend, to cultivate friendly intercourse" (comp. Ps. lxv. 4). So recently HITZIG: "There are companions for sociability,"—for he also reads יֵשׁ (or אִשׁ, Mic. vi. 10) for אִישׁ, appealing to the Syr. and Chald., who appear to have read the text in the same way. [BÖTT. supports this emendation or restoration (§ 458, 2,) and proposes without asserting the derivation of the verb from רַע, as a denominative (§ 1126, 2)]. But אִישׁ is proved to be original by the Vulg., THEODORET, *etc.*; and between clauses *a* and *b* there appears to be a proper an-

Digitized by Google

tithesis and not merely a climax. This strictly antithetic relation is also interfered with by the method of explanation adopted by those who, like UMBREIT, ELSTER, *etc.*, render the verb by "ruin themselves, make themselves trouble;" (EWALD'S conception resembles this, except as it has a still more artificial double import "must be a friend to trouble"); the result follows no less from the derivation from רוּעַ, *jubilare* (so the Vers. Venet.: *ἀνὴρ φίλων ὥστε ἀλαλάζειν*, and of recent interpreters HENSLER: "He that hath friends may exult").

[Of the English commentators HOLDEN renders "is ready to be ruined;" NOYES, "brings upon himself ruin;" STUART, "will show himself as base;" MUENSCHER, "will be ruined;" WORDSWORTH, "*for his own destruction,*—his fate is not to be helped by his many friends, but to be ruined by them." Of the Germans not cited by Z., DE WETTE, "*hat viel Umgang zu seinem Untergang;*" BERTHEAU, "*ist um sich als schlechten zu erweisen;*" KAMP., "*so wird einem übel mitgespielt;*" FUERST, "*muss sich als schlecht erweisen.*"—A.]

EXEGETICAL.

1. Ver. 1-9. Against unsociableness, love of controversy, and other ways in which an uncharitable and foolish disposition manifests itself — **He that separateth himself seeketh after his desire,** *i. e.* he who in an unsocial and misanthropic spirit separates himself from intercourse with others, will as a general rule hold in his eye only the satisfaction of his own pleasure and his own selfish interest.— **Against all counsel** (wisdom) **doth he rush on,** *i. e.* against all wise and prudent counsel (comp. iii. 21) he sets himself, and will hear nothing of it. In respect to the verb, comp. remarks on xvii. 14. HITZIG in this passage as in that holds to the signification which he there assumes, and therefore translates, "Against all that is fortunate (?) he gnashes his teeth."

Ver. 2. Compare similar censures of the loquacity of fools, and their delight in their own discourse, as they prefer above all besides to hear themselves speak, and gladly display everywhere their imagined wisdom,—in passages like xii. 23; xiii. 16; xv. 2, *etc.*

Ver. 3. **When wickedness cometh then cometh contempt.** For the sentiment comp. xi. 2.

Ver. 4. **Deep waters are the words of man's mouth.** "Deep," *i. e.* hard to fathom and exhaust (xx. 5; Eccles. vii. 24). This is true, naturally, only of the words of discreet and wise men, who, according to the parallel in clause *b*, are evidently alone intended here. Only they indeed can be called a "flowing brook," *i. e.* a brook never drying up, one always pouring forth an abundant supply of refreshing water; compare a similar phrase in Am. v. 24. Others regard the meaning of the second clause as contrasted with the first, as they either define "deep waters" in a bad sense, of dark, obscure, enigmatical words (DÖDERLEIN, ZIEGLER), or, in spite of the parallel in xx. 5, read כִּי מַעֲמַקִּים instead of מַיִם עֲמֻקִּים, and understand "waters of excavation," and think of the contrast between cistern waters which readily fail, and a genuine spring of water, Jer. ii. 13 (so HITZIG).

Ver. 5. **To have regard to the wicked is not good.** The last phrase used as in xvii. 26. The first, lit., "to lift up, to show respect to the face of some one" (LXX: *θαυμάσαι πρόσωπον*), as in Lev. xix. 15; Deut. x. 17, *etc.* [Z. renders still more specifically "to take part, to take sides," *etc.*].—With clause *b* comp. xvii. 23; Isa. x. 2; Am. ii. 7, *etc.;* with the sentiment as a whole, xvii. 15.

Vers. 6 and 7 are in close connection; for the former comp. xix. 29; for the latter, xiii. 8. To the idea, which occurs in the parallel passage also, of "destruction, or ruin," there is here added by way of exemplification the figure of a "snare," as employed by huntsmen; comp. xii. 13; xiii. 14; xiv. 27.

Ver. 8. **The words of a slanderer are as words of sport.** The slanderer, or backbiter, as in xvi. 28. The predicative epithet מִתְלַהֲמִים is here, as also in xxvi. 22, where the whole verse is literally repeated, very variously interpreted. It is most obvious to go back to a root לָהַם assumed to be cognate with לָהָה, "to play, to sport" (comp. remarks on xxvi. 10), and accordingly to find contrasted the design of the inconsiderate words of the backbiter, intended, as it were, sportively, and their deeply penetrating and sorely wounding power (see clause *b*). So C. B. MICHAELIS, BERTHEAU, ELSTER, *etc.* Others explain differently; *e. g.* SCHULTENS, UMBREIT (following the Arabic), as "dainty morsels" [so GESEN., DE W., N., M., W.]; EWALD, "as if whispering;" HITZIG, "like soft airs;" [FUERST, "like murmured, mysterious, oracular words;" while the rendering given in the E. V., as also by some commentators, supposes a transposition of the radical consonants (for הלם); BERTHEAU and STUART agree substantially with our author. The whole matter is conjectural, the word occurring in the Hebrew Scriptures but twice, and no sure analogy existing for our guidance.—A.]—**Into the innermost parts of the body,** lit., "into the chambers," *etc.;* comp. xx. 27, 30; xxvi. 22.

Ver. 9. **He also who is slothful in his work is brother of the destroyer,** lit., "of the master of destruction,"—for the participle form מַשְׁחִית is here impersonal as in Ezek. v. 16: "the master of destruction" means "the destroyer" (xxviii. 23) and here the squanderer, who wastes his possessions, the *dissipans sua opera* (Vulg.), and not the highway robber or the captain of banditti as HOFMANN, *Schriftbew.* II., 2, 377, maintains.

2. Vers. 10-16. Seven proverbs of miscellaneous import, referring especially to confidence in God, and humility as the only true wisdom.—**A strong tower is Jehovah's name;** *i. e.* the revealed essence of God, His revelation of Himself in the history of salvation, with its blessed results, shows itself to those who confide in it, who in a childlike spirit submit themselves to its guidance, as a stronghold securely protecting them (so Ps. lxi. 3 (4).) [RUEETSCHI: "The name always designates Himself, as man knows Him, as he receives Him to his knowledge and faith, and bears Him in his heart. It is precisely what man knows of God that is for him a strong tower. When man stumbles or falters it is precisely because he has not run to this refuge, has, as it were, not reminded himself where his strong

Digitized by Google

tower is"].—**The righteous runneth to it and is safe**, lit., "and is lifted up," *i. e.* gains a high and at the same time sheltered station, where the shafts of his enemies can do him no harm. Comp. another form of the same verb in xxix. 25.

Ver. 11. With clause *a* comp. x. 15.—**And as a high wall in his own conceit.** בְּמַשְׂכִּיתוֹ (comp. Ps. lxxiii. 7) the old Vers. Venet. renders quite correctly by ἐν φαντασίᾳ αὐτοῦ, while the Vulg., the Chald., *etc.*, read בְּמִשְׁכַּתוֹ, "in his enclosure," an expression which would be superfluous with the "high wall." [FUERST, starting from this idea of figured or carved work, furniture, *etc*, understands the allusion to be to a "hall of state." Neither the simple meaning nor the complicated construction seems admissible; "and as behind a high wall is he in his hall of state."—A.]

Ver. 12. With *a* compare xvi. 18; with *b*, xv. 33.

Ver. 13. Compare Ecclesiast. xi. 8.

Ver. 14. **The spirit of a man will sustain his infirmity**, lit., "supports his sickness." The spirit that does this is naturally a strong, courageous spirit (comp. Num. xxvii. 18), the opposite of a "smitten" spirit, which rather needs, according to the second clause, that one sustain it. Furthermore the רוּחַ in clause *a* is used as a masculine, because it here appears engaged in the performance of manly action; in clause *b*, on the contrary, as a feminine, because it is represented as powerless and suffering.

Ver. 15. Comp. xiv. 33; xv 14.—**The ear of the wise seeketh knowledge.** The ear here comes into consideration as an organ working in the service of the heart; for it is properly only the heart that pursues the acquisition of wisdom, and which actually acquires it,—not indeed without the co-operative service of the senses (especially hearing, as the symbol and organ of obedience, Ps. xl. 7).

Ver. 16. **A man's gift maketh room for him** [and nowhere more than in the East; see *e. g.* THOMSON'S *Land and Book*, II., 28, 369]. מַתָּן here and in xix. 6 undoubtedly equivalent to שֹׁחַד in chap. xvii. 8, and therefore used of lawful presents, and proofs of generosity, whose beneficent results are here emphasized, as also there, without any incidental censure or irony (as many of the old expositors, and also UMBREIT hold). Altogether too far-fetched is HITZIG'S idea that the "gift" is here "spiritual endowments or abilities," and is therefore substantially like the χάρισμα of the N. T.

3. Vers. 17-21. Against love of contention and misuse of the tongue.—**He that is first is righteous in his controversy**; *i. e.* one thinks that he is altogether and only right in a disputed matter,—then suddenly comes the other and searches him out, *i. e.* forces him to a new examination of the matter at issue, and so brings the truth to light, *viz.* that the first was after all not right. Comp. the same verb in xxviii. 11; also Job xxix. 16, where however the investigator is the judge, and not one of the two contending parties.

Ver. 18. Comp. xvi. 33.—**And decideth between the mighty**, *i. e.* it keeps from hostile collision those who in reliance on their physical strength are specially inclined to quarrel. Comp. Heb. vi. 16, where a like salutary influence is claimed for the judicial oath as here for the lot.

Ver. 19. **A brother** (estranged) **resisteth more than a strong city.** The participle נִפְשָׁע, which, according to the accents, is predicate of the clause, is to be taken in the sense of "setting one's self in opposition, resisting." Now a brother who resisteth or defieth more than a strong city is necessarily an alienated or litigious brother. Furthermore the whole connection of the verse points to this closer limitation of the idea of "brother," and especially the second clause, which aims to represent the difficulty of subduing the passion once set free, under the figure of the bars of a fortress, hard to thrust back or to burst.

Ver. 20. Comp. xii. 14; xiii. 2.

Ver. 21. **Death and life are in the power of the tongue.** Comp James iii. 5 sq.; and also the Egyptian proverb: γλῶσσα τύχη, γλῶσσα δαίμων (PLUTARCH, Is. p. 378).—**He that loveth it shall eat of its fruit**; *i. e.* he that suitably employs himself with it, employs much diligence in using it in discourse, whether it be with good or bad intent, as εὐλογῶν or κακολογῶν, blessing or cursing, (James iii. 9; comp. 1 Cor. xii. 3), will experience in himself the effects of its use or its abuse. Against the one-sided application of this "loving the tongue" to loquacity (HITZIG), is to be adduced the double nature of the expression in the first clause, as well as the analogy of the preceding verse.—The LXX (οἱ κρατοῦντες αὐτῆς) seem to have read אֹחֲזֶיהָ (those laying hold upon it) instead of אֹהֲבֶיהָ, but this reading can hardly have been the original; comp. rather viii. 17, where the verb "to love" expresses essentially the same idea as here, that of a cherishing and cultivating or careful developing.

4. Vers. 22-24. Of conjugal, neighborly and friendly affection.—**Whoso findeth a wife findeth a good thing.** It is naturally a good wife that is meant, a partner and head of the household such as she should be, a wife who really stands by her husband's side as a "helpmeet for him" (Gen. ii. 18, 20). The epithet "good," which the LXX, Vulg, *etc.*, express, is therefore superfluous (comp. also xix. 14; xxxi. 10), and is probably quite as little an element in the original as that which in the same version is appended to our verse: "He that putteth away a good wife putteth away happiness, and he that keepeth an adulteress is foolish and ungodly." With clause *b* compare furthermore iii. 13; xii. 2; Ecclesiast. xxvi. 3. [ARNOT'S view is more defensible: The text which intimates that a prudent wife is from the Lord tells a truth, but it is one of the most obvious of truths: the text which intimates that a wife is a favor from the Lord, without expressly stipulating for her personal character, goes higher up in the history of providence, and deeper into the wisdom of God. So substantially MUFFET, LAWSON and others].

Ver. 23. **The poor useth entreaties, but the rich answereth roughly**, lit., "opposeth

Digitized by Google

hard things" (contrasted with the supplications of clause *a*). Comp. the similar proverbs directed against the hardness of heart of the rich: chap. xiv. 21; xvii. 5.

Ver. 24. **A man of many friends will prove himself base.** The "man of friends," of many friends, the "friend of all the world," will show himself a bad friend,—he with whom is contrasted in clause *b* the instance which is indeed rare and isolated, of a true friendly love, which endures in every extremity (xvii. 17), and even surpasses the devotion of one who is a brother by nature. See Critical notes for an exhibition of the many meanings found in the verse, *etc.*

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL, HOMILETIC AND PRACTICAL.

That the chapter before us treats mainly of the virtues of social life, of sociability, affability, love of friends, compassion, *etc.*, appears not merely from its initial and concluding sentences, the first of which is directed against misanthropic selfishness, the latter against thoughtless and inconstant universal friendship, or seeming friendship, but also from the various rebukes which it contains of a contentious, quarrelsome and partizan disposition, *e. g.* vers. 5, 6, 8, 17-21. But in addition, most of the propositions that seem to be more remote, may be brought under this general category of love to neighbors as the living basis and sum of all social virtues; so especially the testimonies against wild, foolish talking (vers. 2, 7, 13, comp. 4 and 15); that against bold impiety, proud dispositions and hardness of heart against the poor (vers. 3, 12, 23); that against slothfulness in the duties of one's calling, foolish confidence in earthly riches, and want of true moral courage and confidence in God (vers. 9-11; comp. 14). Nay, even the commendation of a large liberality as a means of gaining for one's self favor and influence in human society (ver. 16), and likewise the praise of an excellent mistress of a family, are quite closely connected with this main subject of the chapter, which admonishes to love toward one's fellow-men; they only show the many-sided completeness with which this theme is here treated.

[CHALMERS:—Verse 2 is a notabile. Let me restrain the vanity or the excessive appetite for sympathy which inclines me to lay myself bare before my fellow-men.—LAWSON (on ver. 13):—"Ministers of the word of God are instructed by this rule, not to be rash with their mouths to utter anything as the word of God in the pulpit, but to consider well what they are to say in the name of the Lord; and to use due deliberation and inquiry before they give their judgment in cases of conscience, lest they should make sins and duties which God never made, *etc.*"].

Therefore as a *homily on the chapter as a whole:*—Of love (true love for the sake of God and Christ) as the "bond of perfectness," which must enfold all men, and unite them in one fellowship of the children of God.—Or again: On the difference between true and false friendship (with special reference to ver. 24.)—STÖCKER:—Against division (alienation, contention) between friends. Its main causes are: 1) Within the sphere of the Church impiety (vers. 1-4); 2) Within the sphere of civil life, pride and injustice (vers. 5-10); 3) In domestic life, want of love (vers. 19-24).—*Calwer Handbuch:*—Testimony against the faults which chiefly harm human society.

Vers. 1-9. GEIER (on ver. 1):—Love of separation (*singularitatis studium*) is the source of most contentions in Church and State.—(On ver. 4):—Eloquence is a noble thing, especially when its source is a heart hallowed by the Holy Ghost. —*Berleburg Bible:*—When the soul has once attained steadfastness in God, then words go forth from the mouth like deep waters, to instruct others and to help them; for it is a spring of water, inasmuch as the soul is in the Fountain. —STARKE (on ver. 6):—Calumniators do not merely often start contentions; they themselves seldom escape unsmitten.—VON GERLACH (on ver. 9):—Slothfulness leads to the same end as extravagance.

Vers. 10-16. VON GERLACH (on ver. 10):—The name of Jehovah (He that is) reveals to us His eternally immutable essence; in this there is given to mutable man living here in time the firmest ground of confidence, by which he may hold himself upright in trouble.—STARKE (on ver. 11):—Money and property can, it is true, accomplish much in outward matters; but in the hour of temptation and in the day of judgment it is all merely a broken reed.—[BRIDGES (on vers. 10, 11):—Every man is as his trust. A trust in God communicates a divine and lofty spirit. We feel that we are surrounded with God, and dwelling on high with Him. A vain trust brings a vain and proud heart—the immediate forerunner of ruin.—BATES (on ver. 10, 11):—Covetousness deposes God, and places the world, the idol of men's heads and hearts, on His throne; it deprives Him of His regalia, His royal prerogatives, *etc.* The rich man will trust God no further than according to visible supplies and means].—ZELTNER (on ver. 14):—Wouldst thou have a sound body; then see to it that thou hast a joyful heart and a good courage, a heart which is assured of the grace of God and well content with His fatherly ordaining.—[T. ADAMS (on ver. 14): The pain of the body is but the body of pain; the very soul of sorrow is the sorrow of the soul.—FLAVEL:—No poniards are so mortal as the wounds of conscience.—WATERLAND:—On the misery of a dejected mind].

Vers. 17-21. [LORD BACON (on ver. 17):—In every cause the first information, if it have dwelt for a little in the judge's mind, takes deep root, and colors and takes possession of it; insomuch that it will hardly be washed out, unless either some clear falsehood be detected, or some deceit in the statement thereof.—ARNOT:—Self-love is the twist in the heart within, and self-interest is the side to which the variation from righteousness steadily tends in fallen and distorted nature.]—STARKE (on ver. 17):—He that hath a just cause is well pleased when it is thoroughly examined; for his innocence comes out the more clearly to view.—ZELTNER (on ver. 19):—The sweeter the wine the sharper the vinegar; accordingly the greater the love implanted by nature, the more bitter the hate where this love

Digitized by Google

is violated.—[Trapp (on ver. 19):—No war breaks out sooner or lasts longer, than that among divines, or as that about the sacrament; a sacrament of love, a communion, and yet the occasion, by accident, of much dissension].—*Tübingen Bible* (on ver. 20, 21):—Speak and be silent at the right time and in the divine order, and thou shalt be wise and blessed.

Ver. 22. Luther (marginal note on ver. 22): The married who is truly Christian knows that, even though sometimes things are badly matched, still his marriage relation is well pleasing to God, as His creation and ordinance; and what he therein does or endures, passes as done or suffered for God.—Stöcker: Praise of an excellent wife (*probæ conjugis commendatio*): 1) how such a one may be found; 2) what blessing her husband has in her.—Zeltner: The great mystery of Christ and His church (Eph. v. 32) must ever be to married Christians the type and model of their relation.—Von Gerlach: The great blessing of a pious wife can only be found, not won or gained by one's own merit.

Vers. 23, 24. Starke (on ver. 23): If poor men must often enough knock in vain at the doors and hearts of the rich of this world, this should be to them only an impulse, to plead and to call the more on God who surely hears them. (On vers. 24): Pour out your heart before the Lord in every extremity; He is a friend whose friendship never dies out.—Von Gerlach (on ver. 24): The number of one's friends is not the thing,—they are often false, unfaithful, and forsake us in misfortune. Let none despair for that reason; there are friends who are more closely and intimately joined to us than even brothers.—[Arnot: The brother and the friend are, through the goodness of God, with more or less of imperfection, often found among our fellows; but they are complete only in Him who is the fellow of the Almighty.]

δ) Admonition to humility, mildness, and gentleness.

Chap. XIX.

1 Better is the poor that walketh in his integrity
than he that is perverse in speech and is a fool.
2 Where the soul hath no knowledge there likewise is no good,
and he that is of a hasty foot goeth astray.
3 The foolishness of man ruineth his way,
yet against Jehovah is his heart angry.
4 Wealth maketh many friends,
but the poor is parted from his friend.
5 A false witness shall not go unpunished,
and he that speaketh lies shall not escape.
6 Many court the favor of the noble,
and every one is friend to him that giveth.
7 All the brethren of the poor hate him,
how much more doth his acquaintance withdraw;—
he seeketh words (of friendship) and there are none.
8 He that getteth understanding loveth his soul,
he that keepeth wisdom shall find good.
9 A false witness shall not go unpunished,
he that speaketh lies shall perish.
10 Luxury becometh not the fool,
much less that a servant rule over princes.
11 The discretion of a man delayeth his anger,
and it is his glory to pass over a transgression.
12 The king's wrath is as the roaring of a lion,
but as dew upon the grass is his favor.
13 A foolish son is trouble upon trouble to his father,
and the contentions of a wife are a continual dropping.
14 House and riches are an inheritance from fathers,
but from Jehovah cometh a prudent wife.

Digitized by Google

15 Slothfulness sinketh into inaction,
and an idle soul shall hunger.
16 He that keepeth the commandment keepeth his soul,
he that despiseth his ways shall die.
17 He lendeth to the Lord, that hath pity on the poor,
and his bounty will He requite for him.
18 Correct thy son while there is still hope,
but to slay him thou shalt not seek.
19 A man of great wrath suffereth punishment,
for if thou wardest it off thou must do it again.
20 Hearken to counsel and receive instruction,
that thou mayest be wise afterward.
21 There are many devices in a man's heart,
but Jehovah's counsel, that shall stand.
22 A man's delight (glory) is his beneficence,
and better is a poor man than a liar.
23 The fear of Jehovah tendeth to life;
one abideth satisfied, and cannot be visited of evil.
24 The slothful thrusteth his hand in the dish,
and will not even raise it to his mouth again.
25 Smite the scorner and the simple will be wise,
reprove the prudent and he will understand wisdom.
26 He that doeth violence to his father, and chaseth away his mother,
is a son that bringeth shame and causeth disgrace.
27 Cease, my son, to hear instruction
to depart from the words of wisdom.
28 A worthless witness scoffeth at judgment,
and the mouth of the wicked devoureth mischief.
29 Judgments are prepared for scorners,
and stripes for the back of fools.

GRAMMATICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 15. Altogether unnecessarily HITZIG proposes to read תָּכִיל instead of תַּפִּיל and תְּרָדִים instead of תַּרְדֵּמָה, and translates "slothfulness gives tasteless herbs to eat." [K. calls this a "remarkable alteration of the text;" and RUEETSCHI pronounces it "nothing but a shrewd fancy of HITZIG's"].

Ver. 16. Instead of the K'thibh יוּמַת, "shall be put to death," (the familiar expression of the Mosaic law for the infliction of the death penalty), the K'ri reads more mildly יָמוּת, which is probably original in chap. xv. 10, but not here.—Instead of בּוֹזֵה HITZIG reads in accordance with Jer. iii. 13 פּוֹזֵר: "He that scattereth his ways," but by this process reaches a meaning undoubtedly much too artificial, which furthermore is not sufficiently justified by an appeal to xi. 24; Job xxxi. 7. [While GESEN. makes the primary meaning of בָּזָה "to tread under foot," FUERST makes it "to scatter, divide, waste," and interprets the "dividing one's ways" as a want of conformity to the one established worship. This is in his view the antithesis to "keeping the commandment." The only other passage in which he finds this literal meaning of the verb is Ps. lxxiii. 20, where DE WETTE (see Comm. *in loco*) admits that this would be a simpler completion of the verse, but thinks himself obliged to take the verb, as has usually been done, in the sense of "despise." FUERST's rendering and antithesis seem preferable.—A.].

Ver. 19. Instead of the K'thibh גְּרָל (which would probably require to be explained by "hard" or "frequent," as SCHULTENS and EWALD explain it from the Arabic), we must give the preference to the K'ri, which also has the support of the early translators. [FUERST takes the same view]. HITZIG's emendation, גֹּמֵל instead of גְּרָל (he that dealeth in anger) is therefore superfluous.

Ver. 23. רָע "Calamity, evil" is attached to the passive verb יִפָּקֵד as an accusative of more exact limitation.—HITZIG reads instead of יפקד יִפְחַד, so that the resulting meaning is: "one stretches himself (?) rests, fears no sorrow" (?).

Ver. 25. הוֹכִיחַ in clause *b* is either to be regarded as an unusual Imperative form (= הוֹכַח), [so B., M., S.], or, which is probably preferable, as a finite verb with an indefinite pronoun to be supplied as its subject (τις, *quisquam*, *Einer*, one); so MERCER, HITZIG. [FUERST calls it an Inf. constr., and BÖTT. would without hesitation read תּוֹכִיחַ (§ 1061, *d*).—A.].

Ver. 27. HITZIG alters לִשְׁמֹעַ to לִשְׁמֹץ which according to Arabic analogies is to be interpreted "to be rebellious, to reject."

Digitized by Google

EXEGETICAL.

1. Ver. 1-7. Admonitions to meekness and tenderness as they are to be manifested especially toward the poor.—**Better is a poor man that walketh in his integrity than he that is perverse in speech and is a fool.** The "crooked in lips" (comp. the crooked or perverse in heart, xi. 20; xvii. 20) is here doubtless the proud man who haughtily and scornfully misuses his lips; for to refer the expression to strange and false utterances is less natural on account of the antithesis to "the poor" in clause *a*. The ideas contrasted are on the one hand that of the "poor" and therefore humble, and "perverse of lips," and on the other hand the predicates to these conceptions, "walking in innocence," and the "fool" (*i. e.*, foolish and ungodly at the same time, the direct opposite of humble innocence). There is therefore no need of substituting some such word as עָשִׁיר (rich, mighty) for כְּסִיל (the fool), as the Syr., Vulg. and HITZIG do, nor yet of conceiving of the fool as the "rich fool," as most of the later interpreters judge. Chap. xxviii. 6, where, with a perfect identity in the first clauses, the "rich" is afterward mentioned instead of the "fool," cannot decide the meaning of this latter expression, because the second member differs in other respects also from that of the proverb before us, "his ways" being mentioned instead of "his lips."

Ver. 2. **Where the soul hath no knowledge there likewise is no good.** גַּם, also, stands separated by *Hyperbaton* from the word to which it immediately relates, as in chap. xx. 11 (see remarks above on xiii. 10); the "not-knowing" of the soul, is by the parallel "of hasty foot," in clause *b*, more exactly defined as a want of reflection and consideration; the soul finally, is here essentially the *desiring* soul, or if one chooses, the "desire," the very longing after enjoyment and possession (comp. xiii. 2; xvi. 26). So likewise "he that hasteth with his feet" is undoubtedly to be conceived of as one striving fiercely and passionately for wealth; comp. the "hasting to be rich," chap. xxvii. 20, and also 1 Tim. vi. 9, 10.

Ver. 3. **The foolishness of man ruineth his way.** The verb סַלֵּף is not "to make rugged or uneven" (UMBREIT, ELSTER) but *præcipitare*, "to hurl headlong, throw prostrate, bring suddenly down," which is its ordinary meaning; comp. xiii. 6; xxi. 12. The verb in clause *b* is to rage, to murmur, *i. e.*, here to accuse Jehovah as the author of the calamity; comp. Ex. xvi. 8; Lam. iii. 39; Ecclesiast. xv. 11 sq.

Ver. 4. Comp. xiv. 20; also, below, vers. 6 sq. —**But the poor is parted from his friend**, that is, because the latter wishes to have no further acquaintance with him, separates his way wholly from him; comp. ver. 7, *b*.

Ver. 5. **A false witness shall not go unpunished**; comp. xvii. 5, and for the expression "uttereth or breatheth out lies" in clause *b*, comp. chap. vi. 19; xiv. 5. The entire proverb occurs again in ver. 9, literally repeated as far as the "shall not escape" at the conclusion, for which in the second instance there appears "shall perish." HITZIG it is true proposes also the exchange for the phrase "he that speaketh lies" in 9, *b*, "he that breatheth out evil;" but the LXX can hardly be regarded as sufficiently reliable witnesses for the originality of this divergent reading.

Ver. 6. **Many court the favor of the noble**, lit. "stroke the face," *i. e.*, flatter him (Job xi. 19) who is noble and at the same time liberal, him who is of noble rank (not precisely "a prince" in the specific sense, ELSTER) and at the same time of noble disposition, comp. xvii. 7, 26. If accordingly the "noble" expresses something morally valuable and excellent, the "gift" in clause *b* cannot express anything morally reprehensible, but must rather be employed in the same good sense as in xviii. 16. "The man of a gift" will therefore be the generous, he who gives cheerfully, and the "aggregate" or "mass" of friends (כָּל־הָרֵעַ) whom he secures by his gifts, will be lawfully gained friends and not bribed or hired creatures. The right conception is expressed as early as the translation of the Vulg, while the LXX, Chald and Syr., embodying the common assumption which finds in the verse a censure of unlawful gifts for bribery, go so far as to read כָּל־הָרָע "every wicked man" (πᾶς ὁ κακὸς, *etc.*).

Ver. 7. Comp. ver. 4, *b*.—**How much more do his acquaintance withdraw from him.** מֵרֵעַ (comp. remarks on chap. xii. 26) we shall be obliged to take here as an abstract with a collective sense ("his friendship" = his friends), for only in this way is the plural of the verb to be explained (for which HITZIG arbitrarily proposes to write יִרְחַק).—**He seeketh words** (of friendship)—**and there are none.** In some such way as this we must explain the third clause, with which this verse seems remarkably enriched (comp. UMBREIT and ELSTER on the passage); the K'thibh is to be adhered to, [so BÖTT. II., p. 60, n. 4) which evidently gives a better meaning than the K'ri, לוֹ הֵן in interpreting which so as to conform to the context expositors have vainly labored in many ways (*e. g.* EWALD: "he that seeketh words, to him they belong;" in like manner BERTHEAU).—The LXX instead of this third clause, which does indeed stand in an exceptional form, like the fragmentary remnant of a longer proverb, have two whole verses; the second of these: *ὁ πολλὰ κακοποιῶν τελεσιουργεῖ κακίαν, ὃς δὲ ἐρεθίζει λόγους, οὐ σωθήσεται* ["he that does much harm perfects mischief; and he that uses provoking words shall not escape:" BRENTON'S Transl. of the LXX], seems at least to come tolerably near to the original sense of the passage. HITZIG through several emendations obtains from this the sense

"He that is after gossip hatcheth mischief,
hunting after words which are nothing."

Others, as BERTHEAU, *e. g.*, infer from the *οὐ σωθήσεται* of the LXX, that the original text instead of לֹא הֵמָּה (they are not) exhibited לֹא יִמָּלֵט (shall not escape), but they supply

Digitized by Google

no definite proof that this is original. At any rate we must conclude that our present text is defective, inasmuch as verses of three members in the main division of the Book of Proverbs which is now before us occur nowhere else. (This is otherwise, it is true, in Division I.; see remarks above on chap. vii. 22, 23, and also in the supplement of Hezekiah's men: Comp. Introd., § 14).

2. Vers. 8-17. Further admonitions to mildness, patience, pity, and other prominent manifestations of true wisdom.—**He that getteth understanding** (comp. xv. 32) **loveth his soul**; comp. the opposite, viii. 36; xxix. 24. For the construction of the predicate לִמְצֹא טוֹב in clause *b* compare notes on xviii. 24; for the expression of chap. xvi. 20, *etc.*

Ver. 9. Comp. notes on ver. 5.

Ver. 10. **Luxury becometh not the fool.** Comp. xvii. 7; xxvi. 1; and for clause *b*, xxx. 22; Eccles. x. 7; Ecclesiast. xi. 5.—Inasmuch as luxury naturally and originally belongs only to princes and the like exalted personages, clause *b* stands as the climax of *a*. That "servants rule over princes" will, it is true, not readily occur among common slaves in their relation to their masters; it may however the more easily happen at the courts of oriental despots, who frequently enough exalt their favorites of humble rank above all the nobles of the realm.

Ver. 11. **The discretion of a man delayeth his anger**, makes him patient, lit. "lengthens, prolongs his anger," [in the sense of defers rather than extends it; his patience is what is "lengthened out" and not his passion]; comp. Isa. xlviii. 9, as well as chap. xiv. 17, above, in regard to impatience as the token of a fool.—**And his glory is to pass over transgression,** lit., "to go away over transgression," comp. Mic. vii. 18.

Ver. 12. **Roaring like that of a lion is the wrath of a king**; comp. xxvi. 2; also xvi. 14; xxviii. 15. With the figure of the sweetly refreshing dew in clause *b* compare xvi. 15; Ps. lxxii. 6.

Ver. 13. **A foolish son is stroke upon stroke to his father.** The plural "troubles, calamities," expresses the repetition, the succession of many calamities; Umbreit and Hitzig therefore will translate "ruin upon ruin;" comp. also Ziegler "a sea of evils."—**And the brawling of a wife is a continual dropping**; for this latter phrase see also xxvii. 15; a pertinent figure, reminding of the distilling of the dew in 12, *b*, although contrasted with it in its impression. The scolding words of the bad wife are as it were the single drops of the steady rain, as her perpetual temper pours itself out.

Ver. 14. Comp. xviii. 22, and the German and English proverb according to which "marriages are made in heaven" ["a proverb which," says Archbishop Trench, "it would have been quite impossible for all antiquity to have produced, or even remotely to have approached"].—Ver. 15. **Slothfulness sinketh into torpor**; lit., "causeth deep sleep to fall" (comp. Gen. ii. 21), brings upon man stupor and lethargy; comp. vi: 9, 10.—With clause *b* compare x. 4; xii. 23.—Ver. 16. With clause *a* comp. xvi. 17; Eccles. viii. 5.—**He that taketh no heed to his ways shall die.**—See critical notes.—Ver. 17.—With clause *a* compare xiv. 31; with *b*, xii. 14; with the general sentiment (which appears also in the Arabic collection of Meidani), Eccles. xi. 1; Matth. xxv. 40; Luke vi. 30-35.

3. Vers. 18-21. Admonition to gentleness in parents and children, with respect to the work of education.—**Correct thy son while there is still hope,**—that is, that he may reform and come to the true life. This last phrase "while there is hope" appears also in Job xi. 18; Jer. xxxi. 16 sq.—With *b* compare xxiii. 13. [Rueetschi calls attention to the deep import of this second clause, ordinarily misunderstood. It is not a caution against excess of severity, but against the cruel kindness that kills by withholding seasonable correction. He suggests as further parallels xiii. 24; iii. 12; xxii. 15; Ecclesiast. xxx. 1.—A.]

Ver. 19. **A man of great wrath suffereth punishment.**—One "great of wrath" is one who has great wrath (Dan. xi. 44; 2 Kings xxii. 13); comp. Jer. xxxii. 19: "One great in counsel."—**For if thou wardest it off thou must do it again.**—For this use of הִצִּיל, lit., "deliver,"—with reference to the ruinous action of angry and contentious men specifically to "avert or ward off" (Hitzig), comp. 2 Sam. xiv. 6. [But this very passage favors more the common rendering; for the object is personal, which requires the meaning "take away, *i. e.*, deliver," while the rendering preferred by Z. and Hitzig demands for the object the עֹנֶשׁ, punishment, of clause *a*. De W., B., N., S., M., W. agree with this view, while K. supports the general idea of Z.—A.] The last phrase can express only the idea that such an interposition must be frequently repeated, and therefore that in spite of all efforts to the contrary the wrathful man must still at last fall into calamity and punishment. The entire verse accordingly gives a reason for the dissuasion in ver. 18 against too violent passion in the correction of disobedient children [but see the supplementary note in regard to the true meaning of clause *b*]; yet this is not done in any such way that the "thou must do it again" would refer to frequent corrections, and so to the sure prospect of real reformation, as many of the older expositors maintain.

Ver. 20. Comp. xii. 15. **Afterward**—lit., in thy future, comp. Job iii. 7; xlii. 12.—Ver. 21 gives the constant direction toward God which the wise conduct of the well trained son must take during his later life. Comp. xvi. 1, 9.

4. Vers. 22-29. Miscellaneous admonitions, relating especially to humanity, truthfulness, the fear of God, *etc.*—**A man's delight is his beneficence.**—חֶסֶד (comp. note on iii. 3) is here to be taken in the sense of the active manifestation of love, or charitableness, for it is not the loving disposition, but only its exhibition in liberal benefactions and offerings prompted by love to others, that can be the object of man's longing, desire or delight: [Fuerst renders "*Zier*," ornament, honor.] Comp. Acts xx. 35: "It is more blessed to give than to receive." With this conception of clause *a* the preference

Digitized by Google

expressed in *b* best corresponds,—that of the poor and lowly to the "man of lies," *i. e.*, the rich man who promises aid, and might give it, but as a selfish, hard-hearted man, still fails to render it.—The LXX and Vulg. deviate somewhat in the first clause from the literal rendering of the original. From their readings, which moreover differ somewhat the one from the other, HITZIG has by combination reached what he represents as the original meaning: "From the revenue (?) of a man comes his kind gift."

Ver. 23. With *a* compare xiv. 27.—**One abideth satisfied and cannot be visited of evil,**—because Jehovah does not suffer such as fear Him to hunger (x. 8), but in every way protects, promotes and blesses them (x. 29; xiv. 26; xviii. 10, *etc.*). The subject of the verbs in clause *b* is strictly the possessor of the fear of God, the devout man.

Ver. 24. **The slothful thrusteth his hand in the dish,** *etc*—An allusion to the well-known method of eating among Oriental nations, which needs no knife and fork. A similar figure to characterize the slothful is found in chap. xii. 27. Compare also the proverb in chap. xxvi. 15, which in the first half corresponds literally with the one before us.

Ver. 25. **Smite the scorner and the simple will be wise.**—Since the scorner, according to chap. xiii. 1 (see notes on this passage), "heareth not rebuke," but is absolutely irreclaimable. the simple who "becometh wise" in view of the punishment with which the other is visited, will be such a one as is not yet quite a scorner, but is in danger of becoming so, and therefore must be deterred by fear of the penalty. In contrast with this "simple" one who walks in the right way only by constraint (comp. remarks on i. 4), the "man of understanding," he who is really prudent, learns at once on mere and simple reproof, because he has in general finer powers to discriminate between good and evil (Heb. v. 14), and has moreover a reliable tendency to good.

Ver. 26. **He that doeth violence to his father.**—The verb שָׁדַד signifies "to assail violently, roughly, to misuse," as in xxiv. 15; Ps. xvii. 9.—הִבְרִיחַ is then "to cause to flee, thrust or chase away."—With *b* compare xiii. 5; with מֵבִישׁ in particular x. 5.

Ver. 27. **Cease, my son, to hear instruction to depart from the words of wisdom.**—Two conceptions are possible: 1) The "instruction" is that of wisdom itself, and therefore a good, wholesome discipline that leads to life; then the meaning of the verse can be only ironical, presenting under the appearance of a dissuasion from discipline in wisdom a very urgent counsel to hear and receive it (so EWALD, BERTHEAU, ELSTER). [To call this "ironical" seems to us a misnomer. "Cease to hear instruction only to despise it." What can be more direct or literally pertinent? Cease to hear "for the departing," *i. e.*, to the end, with the sole result of departure.—A.] 2) The "instruction" is evil and perverted, described in clause *b* as one that causes departure from the words of wisdom. Then the admonition is one seriously intended (thus most of the old expositors, and UMBREIT [W., H., N., S., *etc.*]). We must choose for ourselves between the two interpretations, although the connection in which the proverb stands with the preceding verse seems to speak decidedly for the former of the two.

Ver. 28. **A worthless witness scoffeth at judgment**—*i. e.*, by the lies which he utters.—**And the mouth of the wicked devoureth mischief,**—*i. e.*, mischief is the object of his passionate desire; it is a real enjoyment to him to produce calamity; he swallows it eagerly as if it were a sweet fruit (Job xx. 12; Is. xxviii. 4): he "drinketh it in like water" (Job xv. 16). Thus apprehended the expression "to devour mischief or wrong" has nothing at all offensive in it, and we do not need either with the Chaldee (comp. GEIER, *etc.*) to get rid of it by exchanging the idea of "devouring" for that of "uttering," or in any other way; nor with HITZIG (following the LXX) to read instead of "mischief" (אָוֶן) "justice (דִּין), and to translate accordingly "and the mouth of the wicked devoureth justice."

Ver. 29. **Judgments are prepared for scorners and stripes for the back of fools.**—The "scorners" are quite the same as the "fools," as the first clause of ver. 25 shows; and the "stripes" (the term the same as in xviii. 6) are a special form of "judicial penalties or judgments." The verse as a whole, with which chap. xiv. 3; xxvi. 3 should be compared, stands in the relation of an explanation to the preceding, especially to the idea that the wicked eagerly devours calamity. [Their eagerness is not forgotten by a just God, and fitting judgments await them.—A.]

DOCTRINAL, ETHICAL, HOMILETIC AND PRACTICAL.

In the considerably rich and varied contents of the chapter, that which stands forth most conspicuously as the leading conception and central idea is the idea of the gentleness and mildness to be manifested in intercourse with one's neighbors. Gentleness and an humble devotion, ready even for suffering, man ought to exhibit first of all toward God, against whom it is not proper to complain even in calamity (ver. 3), who is in all things to be trusted (vers. 14, 17), according to whose wise counsels it is needful always to shape the life (ver. 21), and in whose fear one should ever walk (ver. 23). Not less is a gentle demeanor a duty for the married in their mutual intercourse (ver. 13, 14); for parents in the training of their children (vers. 18, 19, 25); for children toward their parents (vers. 20, 26); for the rich in dispensing benefactions among the poor (vers. 1, 4, 7, 22); for rulers and kings toward their subjects (ver. 12; comp. vers. 6, 10); for men in general in their intercourse with their neighbors (ver. 11; comp. vers. 19, 27, 28). By far the larger number of the proverbs in the chapter are therefore arranged with reference to this leading and underlying conception of gentleness; the whole presents itself as a thorough unfolding of the praises and commendations of meekness in the New Testament, which are well known; *e. g.*, Matth. v. 5; James i. 20, 21.—Only some single proverbs are less aptly

Digitized by Google

classified in this connection, such as the warning against hasty, inconsiderate, rash action (ver. 2); that against untruthfulness (vers. 9, 28); against slothfulness (vers. 15, 24); against folly and a mocking contempt of the holy (vers. 8, 16, 29). And yet these interspersed sentences of a somewhat incongruous stamp do not by any means essentially disturb the connection of the whole which is maintained and ruled by the fundamental idea of gentleness.

Therefore we may very suitably, in the *homiletical treatment of the chapter as a whole*, take this as the general subject: The praise of meekness, as it is to be exhibited, 1) in respect to God, by the quiet reception of His word (James i. 21), and bringing forth fruit with patience (Luke viii. 15): 2) in relation to one's neighbors, by humility, obedience, love, compassion, *etc.*—Comp. STÖCKER: Against contempt of poor neighbors: 1) Dissuasion from this peculiarly evil fruit of wrath and uncharitableness (vers. 1-15); 2) enumeration of some of the chief means to be used against wrath in general (*remedia, s. retinacula iræ*, vers. 16-29).—WOHLFARTH: On contempt of the poor, and the moderation of anger.

Vers. 1-7. GEIER (on ver. 1): To the pious poor it may impart a strong consolation, that notwithstanding their poverty they are better esteemed in the sight of God than a thousand ungodly and foolish rich men.—*Berleburg Bible* (on ver. 1): He who has nothing that is his own, who accounts himself the poorest of all men, who sees nothing good in himself, and yet with all this stands in the uprightness of his heart and in all simplicity, is far more pleasing to God than the souls that are rich in endowments and in learning, and yet despise and deride the simple.—STARKE (on ver. 4): Art thou forsaken by thy friends, by father and mother, by all men, be of good comfort! if it be only on account of goodness, God will never forsake thee.—(On vers. 6, 7): We often trust in men more than in God, but find very often that this hope in men is abortive, and is brought to shame.—[ROBERT HALL (on ver. 2): Sermon on the advantages of knowledge to the lower classes.—T. ADAMS (on ver. 4): Solomon says not the rich man, but riches; it is the money, not the man, they hunt.]

Vers. 8-17. [MUFFET (on ver. 8): Every one hath a heart, but every one possesseth not his heart. He possesseth his heart that, furnishing it with knowledge of the truth, holdeth his heart firm and fast therein, not suffering his courage to fail, nor losing that good possession which he hath gotten.—CHALMERS (on ver. 10): With all the preference here expressed for virtuous poverty—the seemliness of rank and the violence done by the upstart rule of the lower over the higher, are not overlooked.]—MELANCHTHON (on ver. 10): The ungoverned and uneducated are in prosperous conditions only the more insolent and base, as, *e. g.*, Rehoboam, when he became king, Alexander the Great after his great victories, *etc.*—*Tübingen Bible* (on ver. 11): It is great wisdom to bear injustice with patience, and to overcome and even to gain over one's persecutors with benefits, 1 Pet. ii. 19; Matth. v. 44 sq.—(On vers. 13, 14): God's wise providence manifests itself very specially in the bestowal of good and pious partners in marriage.—VON GERLACH (on ver. 17): The poor the Lord regards as specially His own, and therefore adjusts those debts of theirs which they cannot pay.—*Berleb. Bible:* With that which the righteous man dispenses in benefactions to the poor, he is serving God in his counsels with respect to men.—[Lord BACON (on ver. 11): As for the first wrong, it does but offend the law; but the revenge of that wrong putteth the law out of office. Certainly, in taking revenge a man is but even with his enemy, but in passing it over he is superior.—TRAPP (on ver. 11): The manlier any man is, the milder and readier to pass by an offence. When any provoke us we say, We will be even with him. There is a way whereby we may be not even with him, but above him, and that is, forgive him.—ARNOT: The only legitimate anger is a holy emotion directed against an unholy thing. Sin, and not our neighbor, must be its object; zeal for righteousness, and not our own pride, must be its distinguishing character.—MUFFET (on ver. 17): The Lord will not only pay for the poor man, but requite him that gave alms with usury, returning great gifts for small. Give, then, thy house, and receive heaven; give transitory goods, and receive a durable substance; give a cup of cold water and receive God's Kingdom —W. BATES: As there are numerous examples of God's blasting the covetous, so it is as visible He prospers the merciful, sometimes by a secret blessing dispensed by an invisible hand, and sometimes in succeeding their diligent endeavors in their callings.]

Ver. 18-21. *Tübingen Bible:* Cruelty to children is no discipline. Wisdom is needful, that one in the matter of strictness may do neither too much nor too little to them.—ZELTNER: Too sharp makes a notched edge, and too great strictness harms more than it helps, not only in the discipline of children, but in all stations and relations.—STARKE (on ver. 21): God is the best counsellor. Who ever enters upon His cause with Him must prosper in it.—[J. FOSTER: The great collective whole of the "devices" of all hearts constitutes the grand complex scheme of the human race for their happiness. Respecting the object of every device God has His design. There is in the world a want of coalescence between the designs of man and God; an estranged spirit of design on the part of man. God's design is fixed and paramount, and "shall stand."]

Vers. 22-29. MELANCHTHON (on ver. 25): Not all, it is true, are improved by the warning example of the correction which comes upon the wicked, but some, that is, those who are rational and not insane, those who hearken to admonition and follow it.—STARKE (on ver. 25): The final aim of all penalty should be the improvement as well of him who is punished as of others who may there see themselves mirrored.—(On ver. 26): He who would not experience shame and sorrow of heart from his children, let him accustom them seasonably to obedience, to the fear of God and reverence.—J. LANGE: God's word is the right rule and measure of our life. Whosoever departs from this, his instruction is deceitful and ruinous.—HASIUS (on ver. 29): Every sin, whether great or small, has by God's ordinance

Digitized by Google

its definite penalty. Happy he who recognizes this, and knows how to shun these punishments.

[Bp. Hall (on ver. 22): That which should be the chief desire of a man is his beneficence and kindness to others; and if a rich man promise much and perform nothing, a poor man that is unable either to undertake or perform is better than he.—Arnot: A poor man is better than a liar; a standard has been set up in the market place to measure the pretences of men withal, and those who will not employ it must take the consequences.—Chalmers (on ver. 28): Religion may begin with fear, but will end in the sweets and satisfactions of a spontaneous and living principle of righteousness.—Bp. Sherlock (on ver. 27); Since the fears and apprehensions of guilt are such strong motives to infidelity, the innocence of the heart is absolutely necessary to the freedom of the mind. We must answer for the vanity of our reasonings as well as the vanity of our actions, and if we take pains to invent vain reasoning to oppose to the plain evidence that God has afforded us of His being and power, and to undermine the proofs and authority on which religion stands, we may be sure we shall not go unpunished.]

ε) Admonition to avoid drunkenness, sloth, a contentious spirit, etc.

Chap. XX.

1 Wine is a mocker, strong drink boisterous,
whosoever is led astray thereby is not wise.
2 As the roaring of a lion is the dread of the king;
he that provoketh him sinneth against his own soul.
3 It is an honor to a man to dwell far from strife,
but every fool breaketh forth.
4 The sluggard plougheth not because of the cold;
he seeketh in harvest and hath nothing.
5 Counsel in the heart of a man is as deep waters,
but a wise man draweth it out.
6 Many proclaim each his own grace;
but a faithful man who can find?
7 He who in his innocence walketh uprightly,
blessed are his children after him!
8 A king sitting on his throne,
searcheth out all evil with his eyes.
9 Who can say, I have made my heart clean,
I am pure from my sin?
10 Divers weights and divers measures,
an abomination to Jehovah are they both.
11 Even a child maketh himself known in his deeds,
whether his work be pure, and whether it be right.
12 The ear that heareth, and the eye that seeth—
Jehovah hath created them both.
13 Love not sleep, lest thou come to poverty;
open thine eyes, and be satisfied with thy bread.
14 "It is bad, it is bad!" saith the buyer,
but when he is gone his way then he boasteth.
15 There is gold, and a multitude of pearls;
but a precious vase are lips of knowledge.
16 Take his garment that is surety for a stranger,
and for strangers make him a bondsman.
17 Bread of deceit is sweet to a man,
but afterward his mouth is filled with gravel.
18 Plans are established by counsel,
and with good advice make war.

Digitized by Google

19 He that goeth about as a talebearer revealeth secrets;
with him that openeth wide his lips have nothing to do.
20 He that curseth father and mother,
his light goeth out in utter darkness.
21 An inheritance that is hastily gained in the beginning,
its end will not be blessed.
22 Say not: Let me avenge the evil!
wait on Jehovah; he will help thee.
23 An abomination to Jehovah are diverse weights,
and a deceitful balance is not good.
24 Man's steps are of Jehovah;
man—how shall he understand his way?
25 It is a snare to a man that he hath vowed hastily,
and after vows to inquire.
26 A wise king sifteth the wicked,
and bringeth the (threshing) wheel over them.
27 The spirit of man is a candle of Jehovah,
searching all the chambers of the body.
28 Grace and truth preserve the king,
and he upholdeth his throne by mercy.
29 The glory of young men is their strength,
and the honor of old men is the grey head.
30 Wounding stripes are a correction of evil,
and strokes in the inner chambers of the body.

GRAMMATICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 2. מתעברו is either to be pointed with Hitzig מְתַעְבְּרוֹ (partic. with suffix from a denominative verb of Aramaic form תַּעְבֵּר, "to throw into a passion, to excite wrath" [עֶבְרָה], or, which is probably simpler, with Ewald, Bertheau, [Fuerst], *etc.*, to conceive of it as a Hithp. participle, whose ordinary meaning, "to become excited against any one," (comp. xxvi. 17) here passes over into the transitive idea, "to excite some one against one's self, to call some one forth against one's self." Altogether too artificial, and in conflict with the old versions (LXX: ὁ παροξύνων αὐτόν; Vulg.: *qui provocat eum*) is Umbreit's explanation: "he that arouseth himself (riseth up) against him [the king]." [E. V., H., S., M., *etc.*, agree with our author; De W. and Noyes, with Umbreit].

Ver. 3. שֶׁבֶת is according to the Masoretic punctuation the Infinitive of יָשַׁב [as in Isa. xxx. 7] and not, as most of the recent interpreters [among them Umbreit, Ewald, Hitzig, [Fuerst, M., *etc.*]], regard it, a substantive from the root שָׁבַת, for which derivation certainly no other support could be adduced than Ex. xxi. 19.

Ver. 4. The K'ri וְשָׁאַל is doubtless preferable to the K'thibh יִשְׁאַל (Ps. cix. 10), for "to beg in harvest" would give a meaning too intense. [So H., S., *etc.*].—Hitzig changes מֵחֹרֶף into מְחֹרֶף, which, according to Arabic analogies, should mean "a fruit basket;" he then reads יִשְׁאַל "he demands, desires," and obtains the meaning:

"A pannier [?] the sluggard doth not provide [?],
"trieth to borrow [?] in harvest, and nothing cometh of it [?]."

Ver. 9. [טִהַרְתִּי, cited by Bött. § 948, *c*, as one of the examples of the "stative" perfect, used to describe spiritual states. יֹאמַר, one of his examples of the "*Fiens licitum*," the Imperf. used to express what can be: "who can say;" § 950, β.—A.]

Ver. 16. [לְקַח standing emphatically at the beginning of a verse, one of the few instances of the full Imperative form; Bött. § 1101, 2—A.].

Ver. 18. Ewald proposes instead of עֲשֵׂה to read the Infin. עֲשׂה, as in chap. xxi. 3; but the Imperative seems more appropriate, and gives to the expression greater vivacity.

Ver. 22. [וְיֹשַׁע לָךְ, one of the few examples of double accent, the penultimate accent marking the rhythm, that on the ultima sustaining its vowel; Bött. § 482, *e. f.*—The Jussive form with ו consec. is used to assert a sure result; Bött. "*affirmativ consecutiv*."—A.]

Ver. 25, יָלַע, essentially identical with לָעָה, signifies, according to the Arabic, "to speak inconsiderately, to promise thoughtlessly;" קֹדֶשׁ is here not a substantive, but an Infinitive continuing the finite verb. According to this simple explanation, which is lexically well justified, Ewald's conception of ילע as a substantive, which should be pointed יֶלַע, and translated, "hasty vow," may be dismissed as superfluous; and also the derivation preferred by Jerome, Luther and others of the older expositors, from the root לוע "to swallow" [Vulgate: *devorare sanctos;* Luther: "*das Heilige lästern*"]. [Gesen. and Fuerst are authorities for the view adopted by our author, while Bött., with great positiveness [§ 964, 5 and n. 7] pronounces the form a Jussive form with a "permissive" meaning, from לוע or לעע; "let him only, i. e. if he only hurry or hasten too much."—A.]

Ver. 29. [בַּחוּרִים, young men, *juvenes*, as distinguished from בְּחוּרִים, youth, *juventas;* comp. Bött., § 408, β.—A.].

EXEGETICAL.

1. Vers. 1-5. Various precepts of prudence and integrity, (especially directed against drunkenness, a contentious spirit and indolence).—**Wine is a mocker.** The spirit of wine, and in like manner that of "mead" or "strong drink" (שֵׁכָר, σίκερα, Luke i. 15),* a frequent accompaniment or substitute of wine (comp. Lev. x. 9; Num. vi. 3; Judg. xiii. 4 sq.; Isa. v. 11; xxviii. 7, *etc.*), appears here "personified, or represented as in a sense an evil demon, which excites to frivolous wantonness, to wild and boisterous action, and by the confusion of the senses into which it plunges man, robs him of all clear self-possession" (ELSTER).—**Whosoever is led astray thereby is not wise.** With this phrase "to stagger, or reel because of or under something" comp. v. 19. For the general meaning, Isa. xxviii. 7.

Ver. 2. With clause *a* compare xix. 12 (which is literally identical with the clause before us, except that this has אֵימָה, "dread" [terrible word, an utterance that spreads terror] instead of זַעַף).—**He that provoketh him sinneth against his own soul.** For the first phrase see Critical Notes.—"Sinneth against his own soul" (נַפְשׁוֹ, an accusative of respect); comp. kindred although not identical expressions in viii. 36; vi. 32.

Ver. 3. **It is an honor to a man to dwell far from strife.** See Critical Notes. To "dwell far from strife" is an apt expression to describe the quiet, peaceable demeanor of the wise man, in contrast with the passionate activity of the contentious multitude. For the meaning and use of the verb of clause *b*, יִתְגַּלָּע, comp. xvii. 14; xviii. 1; with the meaning of the whole expression comp. xix. 11.

Ver. 4. **The sluggard plougheth not because of the cold,** that is, because the season in which his field should be cared for is too disagreeably rough and cold for him. [For illustration see THOMSON'S *Land and Book*, I., 207]. In consequence of this indolent procedure "he *seeketh* in harvest"—for fruits of his field—"and there is nothing." See Critical Notes. [RUEETSCHI, *ubi supra*, p. 149, retaining the general meaning, objects that the term here used is not the one that of itself describes the cold and stormy harvest time; he therefore retains the temporal meaning of the preposition, and renders, "from the time of the (fruit) harvest onward," *etc.*, this being the proper time for the ploughing and sowing, a time which none can suffer to pass by.—A.]

Ver. 5. **Counsel in the heart of man is as deep waters,** *etc.; i. e.* the purpose that one has formed may be difficult to fathom (see the same figure, chap. xviii. 4); a wise man nevertheless draws him out, elicits from him his secret, and brings it to light. דָּלָה means to "draw" water with a bucket (דְּלִי, Isa. xl. 15), to bring it up laboriously from a deep place (Ex. ii. 16, 19)—a metaphor suggested by the figure in clause *a*, and evidently very expressive.

2. Vers. 6-11. On the general sinfulness of men.—**Many proclaim each his own grace** (or love). The verb which is originally to "call" is here to "proclaim, to boast of," *prædicare.* אִישׁ, "each individual" of the "many a man," the mass or majority of men.—**But a faithful man who can find?** For the phrase "a man of fidelity," comp. xiii. 17; xiv. 5; for the general meaning, Ps. cxvi. 11; Rom. iii. 4.

Ver. 7. **He who in his innocence walketh upright.** Thus, taking צַדִּיק attributively, as an adjective subordinated to the participle, the LXX, Vulg., Syr., had already treated the construction, and later EWALD and HITZIG [and KAMPH.]; while recent expositors generally render, "is a righteous man" [H. and N.], or in other instances treat the "righteous" as the subject (UMBREIT, ELSTER, *etc.*), [S. and M., E. V., and DE W.].—With this benediction upon the descendants of the righteous in clause *b* comp. xiv. 26; with the אַחֲרָיו "after him," *i. e.* after his death, Gen. xxiv. 67; Job xxi. 21.

Ver. 8. **A king . . . . searcheth out all evil with his eyes.** The natural reference is to the king as he corresponds with his ideal, that he be the representative on earth of God, the supreme Judge. Comp. xvi. 10; also Isa. xi. 4, where similar attributes to these are ascribed to the Messiah, as the ideal typically perfect king. With this use of the verb "to sift or winnow," to separate, comp. ver. 26.

Ver. 9. **Who can say: I have made my heart clean, I am pure from my sin?** The question naturally conveys a decided negative by implication: "No one can say," *etc.;* comp. ver. 6 *b*, and ver. 24 *b*. It is not a permanent purity, a "having kept one's self pure" (from birth onward) that is the subject of the emphatic denial in this proverb (in opposition to BERTHEAU'S view), but a having attained to moral perfection, the having really conquered all the sins that were in existence before, that is denied. We should therefore bring into comparison not passages like Job xiv. 4; xv. 14; Ps. li. 5 (7), but such as 1 Kings viii. 46; Eccles. vii. 20; 1 John i. 8; James iii. 2, *etc.* With this expression, "I have made my heart clean," comp. Ps. lxxiii. 13.

Ver. 10 draws attention to deception in business intercourse as a peculiar and prominent form of that universal sinfulness which has just been spoken of as having no exceptions. Comp. chap xi. 1, and ver. 23 below. With the language in clause *b* compare xvii. 15 *b*.

Vers. 11. **Even a child maketh himself known in his deeds.** With regard to the גַּם, "even," which does not belong to the word next following, but to the נַעַר, "child" (as GEIER, UMBREIT, ELSTER, HITZIG rightly interpret), comp. remarks on xix. 2.—"His deeds" EWALD and UMBREIT are inclined to render by "plays, sports," in disregard of the uniform meaning of the word, and in opposition to the only correct construction of the "even." מַעֲלָלִים is rather the works, the actions, the individual results of

* For a full and valuable discussion of the meaning of these and kindred terms, see an article by Dr. LAURIE in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, January, 1860.—A.

Digitized by Google

the child's self-determination, from which it may even now be with confidence inferred of what sort "his work" is, *i. e.* the entire inner tendency of his life, his character (if one prefers the notion), the nature of his spirit (Hitzig).—That this thought also stands related to the fact of universal sinfulness needs no fuller demonstration. Comp. the familiar German proverb, "*Was ein Dörnchen werden will spitzt sich bei Zeiten*" [what means to become a thorn is early sharpening].

3. Vers. 12-19. Admonitions to confidence in God, to industry, prudence and integrity.—**The ear that heareth, and the eye that seeth—Jehovah hath created them both.** An allusion, plainly, not to the adaptation, the divine purpose and direction in the functions of hearing and seeing (Hitzig), but to God's omniscience as a powerful motive to the fear of God and confidence in Him; comp. xv. 3, and especially Ps. xciv. 9.

Ver. 13. With *a* compare vi. 9, 10.—**Open thine eyes, and thou shalt be satisfied with bread.** The imperative clause, "be satisfied with bread," has here the meaning of a consecutive clause, as in iii. 4. [This illustrates what Bött., § 957, 6, calls the "desponsive" use of the Imperative, conveying sure promises]. With this language compare xii. 11. To "open the eyes" is naturally the opposite of sleep and drowsiness, and therefore the description of wakeful, vigorous, active conduct.

Ver. 14. **"It is bad, it is bad!" saith the buyer, but when he is gone his way** (וְאֹזֵל לוֹ, for which we should perhaps with Hitzig read וְאָזַל לוֹ, corresponds with the German, "*und trollt er sich*" [when he takes himself off], when he has gone his way) **then he boasteth,** *i. e.* of the good bargain that he has made. The verse therefore censures the well-known craft, the deceitful misrepresentation, with which business men seek to buy their wares as cheap as possible, below their real value if they can. In opposition to the true meaning of קָנֶה, as well as inconsistently with the idea of boasting in the second clause, Schultens and Elster (and Luther likewise) render: "It is bad, it is bad! saith the owner (?) of his possession; but when it is gone(?) then he boasteth of it (?)."

Ver. 15. **There is indeed gold and a multitude of pearls,** *etc.* As these precious things are compared in chap. iii. 14, 15; viii. 11, with intelligent, wise dispositions and discourse, so are they here compared with wise lips, that is, with the organ of wise discourse. In this connection we should doubtless notice the difference between "gold and pearls" as valuable native material, not yet wrought into articles of ornament, and on the other hand, the lips as an artistic "vase" or other "vessel" (that has come forth from the hand of the divine artificer, and is adorned and embellished by man's wise use of it).

Ver. 16. Comp. vi. 1-5; xi. 15; xvii. 18. Instead of the warnings that are there found against foolish suretyship, we have here in a livelier style a demand to give over at once, without hesitation as bondsman any such inconsiderate surety.—**And for strangers make him a surety.** Instead of the K'ri "for a strange woman," *i. e.*, an adulteress, we should unquestionably retain here the K'thibh, "for strangers, unknown people;" while in the corresponding passage, chap. xxvii. 13, נָכְרִיָּה "the strange woman" is undoubtedly the correct reading.

Ver. 17. **Bread of deceit is sweet to a man,** *i. e.*, enjoyments and possessions secured by means of deceit; comp. xxiii. 3; ix. 17.—For this use of "sand, gravel," (an appropriate emblem to describe a thing not to be enjoyed) comp. Lam. iii. 16.

Ver. 18. **Plans are established by counsel.** עֵצָה here equivalent to סוֹד, counsel which one takes with another,—comp. xv. 22.—**And with good advice make war.** The "advice" or management (comp. i. 5) is plainly contemplated as the result of the counsel that has been taken; comp. xxiv. 6.

Ver. 19. With clause *a* compare xi. 13; with *b*, xiii. 3.

4. Vers. 20–23. Against hatred of parents, legacy-hunting, revenge, deceit.—**He that curseth father and mother,** and so in the boldest way transgresses the fifth commandment of the law, (Ex. xx. 12, comp. Ex. xxi. 17; Lev. xx. 9).—**His light goeth out in utter darkness.** The same figure is used also in xiii. 9, here as there serving to illustrate the hopeless destruction of life and prosperity.—In regard to אִישׁוֹן, the "pupil of the eye, blackness, midnight"—for which the K'ri unnecessarily demands the Aramaic אֱשׁוּן—comp. notes on vii. 9.

Ver. 21. **An inheritance that hath been hastily gained in the beginning.** In favor of the K'ri מְבֹחֶלֶת, "hurried, hastened" (comp. Esther, viii. 14, and also remarks above on chap. xiii. 11), we have the testimony of the ancient versions, the parallel in xxviii. 20, 22, and besides the position of this verse after verse 20. For it is precisely the wayward son, who despises and curses his parents, that will be very readily disposed to seize upon his inheritance before the time against their will (comp. Luke xv. 12), and possibly even to drive his parents violently out of their possession (comp. xix. 26). That no blessing can rest upon such possessions, that as they were unrighteously acquired at first so they must in the end be wasted and come to nought, is a truth which clause *b* in a simple way brings to view. The K'thibh מְבֹהֶלֶת would either signify "cursed," in accordance with Zech. xi. 8 (so Elster, *e. g.*, regards it), or in accordance with the Arabic, "acquired by avarice" (so Umbreit). [H., N., W., S., M., Bertheau, Kamph, *etc*, agree in supporting the exposition adopted by our author].

Ver. 22. **Say not: let me avenge the evil;** *i. e*, do not desire to requite evil with evil, do not avenge thyself for offences that have been done thee; comp. xxiv. 29; Deut. xxxii. 35; Rom. xii. 17; 1 Pet. iii. 9.—The second member of clause *b* is evidently a consecutive clause, as the Jussive frequently is after the Imperative;

Digitized by Google

comp. Isa. viii. 10; 2 Kings v. 10. The Vulgate correctly renders "*et liberabit te*," while the LXX, Rosenmueller, Ewald, *etc.*, treat the words as a final clause; "that he may keep thee."

Ver. 23. Comp. ver. 10. **A deceitful balance is not good**; (Z., "is shameful," lit. is "not good, is no good," as in xvii. 26; xviii. 5); a *litotes*, expressing the idea of that which is *very* base.

5. Ver. 24–30. Miscellaneous admonitions to the fear of God and integrity.—**From Jehovah are man's steps**; comp. xvi. 9; Ps. xxxvii. 23. The "steps" are naturally "not acts in their subjective ethical aspect, but these acts according to their result, their several issues in a parallel series of experiences,—and therefore those events depending on the action of man which make up its external counterpart" (Hitzig).—In regard to the emphatic negative import of the question in clause *b*, compare remarks on ver. 9.

Ver. 25. Before the יָלַע קֹדֶשׁ [he hath vowed hastily] there should be supplied the conjunction אִם, "if;" therefore render literally "it is a snare to a man, vows he hastily," *i. e.*, if he in a hasty manner promises to devote a thing to God as sacred (as κορβᾶν, Mark vii. 11). See Critical notes.—Furthermore hasty consecrations, and in like manner, according to clause *b* the hasty assumption of vows, are here called a "snare" (קֹדֶשׁ, comp. remarks on xviii. 7), because he who makes the rash vow afterward easily repents of it, and falls under the temptation sinfully to break or to recall his vow (comp. Numb. xxx. 3; Eccles. v. 3).

Ver. 26. **A wise king sifteth the wicked.** To "sift" or "winnow" expresses here, just as it does in ver. 8, a discriminating separation of the chaff from the grain; comp. for this familiar and pertinent figure Ps. i. 4; Isa. xvii. 13; Am. ix. 9.—**And bringeth the wheel over them**, *i. e.*, the wheel of the threshing cart (Isa. xxviii. 27 sq.), which however is contemplated here not so much as an instrument of harvesting, as rather in the light of a means and emblem of the severe punishment of captive enemies (in accordance with 2 Sam. xii. 31; 1 Chron. xx. 3; Am. i. 3). There is therefore no offence to be taken in view of the fact that in the operation of threshing the crushing with the wheel preceded the winnowing or sifting, while here it is not mentioned until after it (in reply to Bertheau).

Ver. 27. **The spirit of man is a candle of Jehovah**; lit., "man's *breath*," for this is the first meaning of the Hebrew term נְשָׁמָה (Gen. ii. 7); yet it is not the *soul* which pervades and animates all the members of the body (as Hitzig renders), according to the view of many of the elder expositors, as also Starke, Von Gerlach, *etc.*, but the *spirit*, as the higher manifestation of soul-life, or if any one prefers, the *reason, self-consciousness* (Umbreit, Elster) that is intended by the expression. For all analogies are wanting, at least within the range of the Bible, for a comparison of the *soul* with a light (the Arabic maxim in Kazwini *Cosmog.* I. 355, in which the soul, *Nephesch*, is designated the light of the body, plainly has no bearing on our present object). On the contrary the inner light or eye, (τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοί) of which the Lord speaks in Matth. vi. 22, 23, is unquestionably an organ or factor of the higher spiritual soul, more precisely designated as the νοῦς or the reason. In support of the idea that נְשָׁמָה in the passage before us signifies essentially this and nothing else, there may be adduced the identity of נִשְׁמַת חַיִּים with רוּחַ חַיִּים as indicated by a comparison of Gen. vi. 17 with Gen. ii. 7. The expression "candle of Jehovah" moreover seems to point rather to the *spirit* as that factor in human personality which proceeds immediately from God, than to the *soul* which inheres in the physical life, and does not rise essentially above it.*—[Wordsw. and some other English expositors understand the allusion to be specifically to the conscience; the majority are content with the more comprehensive term *spirit*, including intellectual and moral factors.—A.].—**Searching all the chambers of the body**, *i. e.*, looking through its whole interior,—which clearly suggests the *ruling* relation of this "searcher" to the body, the sphere of its activity, and so is very pertinent with respect to the spirit, but not to the soul. In regard to the "chambers of the body" comp. ver. 30, and xviii. 8.

Ver. 28. **Grace and truth preserve the king.** "Mercy and truth," or "love and truth," not quite in the sense of iii. 3; the attributes of a king are intended by the terms, which should rather be rendered "grace and truth." With this idea of "preserving" comp. Ps. xxv. 21; with that of "upholding" in clause *b*, Isa. ix. 6.

Ver. 29. Comp. xvi. 31; xvii. 6.

Ver. 30. **Wounding stripes are a correction of evil and strokes** (that reach) **to the chambers of the body**; *i. e.*, stripes or blows that cause wounds, such as one administers to his son under severe discipline (comp. xix. 18), have this beneficial effect, that they intend a salutary infliction or correction "on the evil" in this son, as a scouring of the rust which has gathered on a metal cleanses and brightens the metal. And not merely does such an external chastening as this accomplish the sharp correction of the son; it penetrates deep into the inmost parts of the body (comp. remarks on ver. 27), *i. e.*, to the innermost foundations of his personal life and consciousness, and so exerts a reforming influence on him. Thus Ewald and Elster correctly render, and substantially Umbreit also (comp. Luther's version, which expresses the true meaning at least in general), while Bertheau regards תַּמְרוּק, "remedial application," as the subject, and (after the analogy of Esther ii. 3, 9, 12) understands it to refer to "the application of ointments and perfumes for beautifying" (! ?); Hitzig, however, naturally emends again, and by changing תַּמְרוּק to תְּמֹר יִקֹּב obtains the meaning: "Wounding stripes drop (?) into the cup of the wicked (?) and strokes into the chambers of the body."—[Our English version is defective from its obscurity: *The blueness of a wound cleanseth away evil.*

* Von Rudloff, *Lehre vom Menschen*, 2d Ed., p. 48, also takes a correct view of the passage.

Digitized by Google

Recent expositors are clearer in their renderings, and differ but slightly in their choice of terms. STUART; *Wounding stripes* (H.; *the bruises of a wound*) *are the remedy for the base* (H.; *are a cleanser in a wicked man*); N. and M.; *The scars* (*stripes*) *of a wound are a cleansing from evil;* WORDSW., paraphrasing somewhat more: *The stripes of a wound are the* (only) *wiping away of* (certain cases of) *evil.*]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

It is evidently impossible to derive the many maxims of the chapter from a single primary and fundamental thought. The warning against drunkenness or the passion of the intemperate, which introduces the diversified series, has in the further progress of the discourse no successor whatsoever of similar form, and could be retained as the theme or the germinal thought for the whole only by the most artificial operations, such as STÖCKER, *e. g.*, and others of former times undertook (comp. the introductory paragraph to the Homiletic hints). Much more readily might a *contentious and revengeful spirit* be regarded as the chief object of the admonitory representations and suggestions of this section (see vers. 2, 3, 6, 14, 19, 22). But a space at least equally large is given to the dissuasions from *indolence and deceit* (vers. 4, 10, 13, 14, 17, 23), and again to the commendations, somewhat more general in their form, of *wise and upright conduct* (vers. 7, 9, 11, 15, 18, 24—26, 29). Only a single group of proverbs in this chap. stands out from the mass of diverse and isolated maxims and aphorisms, as contemplating one object with considerable compactness and unity of view. This is the division which relates to the *general sinfulness* of men (vers. 6-11). And this in fact presents also the richest and most important doctrinal material which the chapter anywhere contains. Starting with the fact, alas! too palpable, that really faithful men, *i. e.*, men who are on all sides reliable, free from all falsehood and untruth, are to be found nowhere on the earth (ver. 6; chap. John viii. 46, and the passages cited above in notes to ver 6), the representation brings into the foreground the ideal of moral innocence, uprightness, and the practical prosperity which belongs to it, as this ought actually to be realized by humanity (ver. 7). It then at once suggests the crying contrast which exists between the real moral condition of humanity and the ethical aim of its perfect state, pointing to the manifold and numberless forms of evil in conflict with which, in judicial exposures and punishments of which, earthly kings even now are engaged (ver. 8). It next gives an outright expression to the universal need of purification and improvement (ver. 9), and then brings forward a special and conspicuous example of the deceitful acts and endeavors of all men, so odious to God (ver. 10). It concludes at length with a hint of that corruption in the devices and impulses of the human heart which appears even in the earliest periods of youth (ver. 11; Gen. viii. 21). The most important of these utterances, which are perhaps intentionally arranged as they are with reference to the very line of thought that has been indicated, is at all events the testimony given in ver. 9 to the impossibility of ever attaining in this present human life to a complete moral purity and perfection. We have here a proverb which, in addition to the universality, guiltiness and penal desert, of the original corruption of human nature, attests very distinctly also its *permanent* character, *i. e.*, its continued obstinate and ineradicable inherence in the soul and body of man, its "*tenacitas, sive pertinax inhæsio*," by virtue of which a certain spark of evil (or tinder for evil), a concealed germ and root of sinful lust (*fomes peccati s. concupiscentia*) remains in all men, even the most sanctified and morally elevated, until their very death. This proverb is also especially noteworthy, because "in contrast with the style of conception which is elsewhere predominant in the proverbs, according to which the imperfection of all human piety is but slightly emphasized, and he who is relatively pious is allowed to pass as righteous, it gives expression to the unsatisfying nature of all moral endeavors, as never conducting to the full extirpation of the sense of guilt, and a perfect feeling of peace with God; *it accordingly suggests the need of a higher revelation, in which the sense of guilt, and of an ever imperfect fulfilment of duty shall finally be wholly overcome*" (ELSTER).

Memorable doctrinal and ethical truths are furthermore contained, particularly in ver. 1, with its significant personification of the demon of mockery, and wild, boisterous recklessness. which as it were lurks concealed in wine and other intoxicating drinks;—in vers. 12 and 24, with their allusion to the mightily pervading influence of God, the Omniscient, over all the acts and fates of men;—in ver. 22, with its dissuasion from avenging one's self and the spirit of retaliation, so suggestive of the New Testament command of love to enemies;—in ver. 25, with its warning against the hasty assumption of religious vows;—in ver. 27, with its beautiful illustration of the all-embracing authority, and the moulding influence which man's spirit, as his inward divine light, must exercise over his entire physical and spiritual life (and in the normal self-determination does actually exercise);—and finally, in ver. 28, with its admirable exaltation of the loving, faithful, upright disposition of kings as the firmest prop to their thrones. Compare above, the Exegetical explanations of all these passages.

[LAWSON (on ver. 7): The integrity of the just man is not like the pretended integrity of the moralist, for it includes piety, justice, sobriety, and a conscientious regard to every precept of God, without excluding those that appear to vain men to be of small importance, or those that most directly oppose the prevailing disposition of the mind.—CHALMERS (on ver. 27): In order to salvation, the Spirit must deal with the subjective mind, and illuminate the ruling faculty there, as well as set the objective word before us, which is of His own inspiration. A more vivid conscience will give us a livelier sense of God's law: a more discerning consciousness, reaching to all the thoughts and tendencies of the inner man, will give us a more convincing view of our sad and manifold deficiencies from that law.]

Digitized by Google

HOMILETIC AND PRACTICAL.

Homily on the chapter as a whole: The general sinfulness and need of salvation on the part of all men, demonstrated 1) from the magnitude and variety of the vices that prevail in humanity; 2) from the rareness of a sincere striving after virtue; 3) from the absolute impossibility of finding complete purity and holiness except in Christ.—STÖCKER (less in harmony with the proper and chief contents of the chapter; comp. what has been said above): Of intemperance in drinking, and its evil consequences: 1) Delineation of the *ἀσωτία vini;* 2) Reference to the *incommoda* (the inconveniences), and 3) to the *remedia ebrietatis* (the remedies of drunkenness).—In like manner WOHLFARTH, *Calwer Handb., etc.;* against the intemperance and the wildness of the scoffer.

Vers. 1–5. STARKE (on ver. 1): He who is inclined to physical drunkenness will not be vigorous spiritually; Eph. v. 18 (comp. VON GERLACH: A wild, unconscious excitement is far from a holy wisdom).—GEIER (on ver. 2): The wrath of an earthly king is intolerable; how much more the infinite eternal wrath of the King of all kings against persistent sinners at the judgment!—[LAWSON (on ver. 3): A fool is so self-conceited that he can bear no contradiction; so impertinent that he will have a hand in every other man's business; so proud that he cannot bear to be found in the wrong; and so stubborn that he will have the last word, although his lips should prove his destruction].—ZELTNER (on ver. 4); On observing times (Rom. xii. 11; Eph. v. 18) everything depends in physical as well as spiritual things.—J. LANGE (on ver. 5); For the testing, searching, and discriminating between spirits, there should be a man who is furnished with the spirit of Christ.

Vers. 6-11. ZELTNER (on ver. 6): It is far better to show one's self in fact pious, benevolent, true and upright, than merely to be so regarded and proclaimed.—[TRAPP (on ver. 7): Personal goodness is profitable to posterity; yet not of merit, but of free grace, and for the promise' sake].—STARKE (on ver. 8): When Christ, the Lord and King of the whole world, shall at length sit in judgment, then will all evil be driven away by His all holy eyes, brought to an end and punished.—(On verse 9): The justified have and keep sins within them even to their death; but they do not let these rule in them, Rom. vi. 11. He betrays his spiritual pride and his entanglement in gross error, who imagines, and, it may be, also maintains, that he has within himself no more sins, 1 John i. 8, 9.—(On ver. 11): He that has charge of the training of children, benefits not them only, but the whole of human society, when he incites flexible, well-disposed spirits to good, and seeks to draw away the vile from evil with care and strictness.

Ver. 12-19. MELANCHTHON (on ver. 12): To the successful conduct of a state two things are always needful: 1) good counsels of the rulers, and 2) willing obedience of the subjects. Both Solomon declares to be gifts of God, when he describes Him as the Creator both of the hearing ear and of the seeing eye.—GEIER (on ver. 12): It is God from whom we possess all good as well in temporal as in spiritual things (James i. 16): as He has given us eyes and ears, so will He also give us a new heart (Ezek. xi. 19).—ZELTNER (on ver. 14): Acknowledge with thanks God's present bounties, as long as thou hast them, and employ them aright, that God may not suddenly take them from thee, and thou then for the first time become aware what thou hast lost.—EGARD (on ver. 17): It is the way of sin and fleshly lust that it at first seems attractive to man, but afterward, when conscience wakes, causes great disquiet and anguish.—[Lord BACON (on ver. 18): The greatest trust between man and man is the trust of giving counsel. . . Things will have their first or second agitation; if they be not tossed upon the waves of counsel, they will be tossed upon the waves of fortune, and be full of inconstancy, doing and undoing, like the reeling of a drunken man.]—*Tübingen Bible* (on ver. 18): To wage war is allowed, for there are righteous wars; but they must be conducted with reason and reflection (compare General YORK's prayer and motto at the beginning of every battle: "The beginning, middle, end, O Lord, direct for the best!").—J. LANGE (on ver. 19): Rather hear him much who reveals to thee what harms thee, than him who flatters thee.—VON GERLACH (same verse): In all inconsiderate talking about others there is always some delight in evil or slander running along through it; just as also all tattling and idle gossip of this kind always has something exceedingly dangerous in it.

Ver. 20-23. MELANCHTHON (on ver. 21): It is of moment always to wait for God's ordinary call, to distinguish the necessary from the unnecessary, and to attempt nothing outside of our lawful calling.—LANGE (same verse): That for which one strives with inconsiderate craving in unlawful ways turns not into blessing, but to a curse.—ZELTNER (on ver. 22): To withstand passion, to wait in patience for the Lord's help, and to plead for the welfare of the evil doer is the best revenge on an enemy.—*Berleburg Bible* (same verse): Revenge always springs from pride; thou wouldst willingly be like God, and be thine own helper, avenger and judge; this pride then kindles thine anger within thee, so that thou for heat and violence canst not wait until God disposes of the matter for thee.—[LAWSON: By indulging your revengeful spirit, you do yourself a greater hurt than your greatest enemy can do you, for you gratify his ill nature when you suffer it to make a deep impression on your spirit, without which it could do you little or no hurt; but by committing your cause to God, you turn his ill-will to your great advantage, making it an occasion for the exercise of the noblest graces, which are attended with the sweetest fruits, and with the rich blessing of God.]

Ver. 24-30. GEIER (on ver. 24): No one can rightly begin and walk in the way to the kingdom of heaven, who would enter without Christ; John xiv. 6; xv. 5.—[CHALMERS (on ver. 24): Man can no more comprehend the whole meaning of his own history, than he can comprehend the whole mind of that God who is the Sovereign Lord and Ordainer of all things.]—*Berleburg Bible* (on ver. 25): In vows it is important to reflect with the utmost circumspection, before one

Digitized by Google

forms a definite purpose. But what one has once vowed, against it he should seek no pretext of any kind to annul it.—STARKE (on ver. 25): The outward service of God without real devotion becomes a snare to many, by which they deceive their souls and plunge into ruin.—(On ver. 27): Know the nobility of the human soul, this candle of the Lord! Beware therefore of all conceit of wisdom and contempt of others about thee. Give rather to the illumination of Divine grace its influence on all the powers of thy soul, that when thine understanding is sufficiently enlightened thy will also may be reformed.—[STODDARD: The Spirit does not work by giving a testimony, but by assisting natural conscience to do its work. Natural conscience is the instrument in the hand of God to accuse, condemn, terrify, and to urge to duty.]—A. SCHRÖDER (on ver. 28—in the *Sonntagsfeier*, 1840): How the relation of the king to his people and of the people to their king can be a blessed one solely through the purity and sincerity of both).—RUST (same verse—same source, issue for 1834); Of the exalted blessing which a living Christianity ensures to all the relations of the State.—LANGE (on ver. 29): Art thou still a youth in Christian relations; prove thy strength by conquest over thyself; art thou become grey and experienced in them, prove thy wisdom by love and a blameless life; 1 John ii. 13, 14.—(On ver. 30): There is much evil about and within us from which we must be cleansed and purified; God uses to this end the inward and outward trials of this life.—Comp. LUTHER's marginal comment on ver. 30: "*Mali non verbis sed verberibus emendantur;* pain is as needful as eating and drinking."

ζ) **Admonition to integrity, patience, and obedient submission to God's gracious guidance.**

CHAP. XXI.

1 Like streams of water is the heart of a king in Jehovah's hand;
he turneth it whithersoever he will.
2 Every way of man is right in his own eyes,
but Jehovah trieth hearts.
3 To do justice and judgment
is more acceptable to Jehovah than sacrifice.
4 Haughty eyes and a proud heart—
the light of the wicked is (nought but) sin.
5 The counsels of the diligent (tend) only to abundance;
but every one who is over hasty (cometh) only to want.
6 The getting of treasures by a lying tongue
is a fleeting breath of them that seek death.
7 The violence of the wicked sweepeth them away,
because they refuse to do justice.
8 Crooked is the way of the guilty man,
but the pure, his work is right (or, straight).
9 It is better to dwell in a corner of the house top,
than with a contentious woman in a thronged house.
10 The soul of the wicked desireth evil;
his neighbor findeth no mercy with him.
11 When the scorner is punished the simple is made wise,
and when the wise is prospered, he will gain knowledge.
12 The Righteous (God) marketh the house of the wicked;
He hurleth the wicked into destruction.
13 He that stoppeth his ear to the cry of the poor,
he also shall call and not be answered.
14 A gift in secret allayeth anger,
and a present in the bosom strong wrath.
15 It is a joy to the just to do justice,
but destruction to them that work iniquity.
16 A man who wandereth from the way of understanding,
shall dwell in the assembly of the dead.

Digitized by Google

17 He becometh a poor man who loveth pleasure;
he that loveth wine and oil shall not be rich.
18 The wicked becometh a ransom for the righteous,
and the faithless for the upright.
19 It is better to dwell in a desert land,
than to live with a contentious and fretful woman.
20 Precious treasure and oil are in the dwelling of the wise,
but a foolish man consumeth them.
21 He that followeth after righteousness and mercy
shall find life, righteousness, and honor.
22 A wise man scaleth the city of the mighty,
and casteth down the strength of its confidence.
23 He that keepeth his mouth and his tongue,
guardeth his soul from troubles.
24 A proud (and) arrogant (man)—scorner is his name;
he acteth in insolence of pride (overflowing of haughtiness).
25 The desire of the slothful killeth him,
for his hands refuse to labor.
26 He desireth intensely all the day long;
but the righteous giveth and spareth not.
27 The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination;
how much more when it is brought for evil!
28 A false witness shall perish,
the man that heareth shall speak evermore.
29 The wicked putteth on a bold face,
but he that is upright establisheth his way.
30 No wisdom, no understanding,
no counsel (is there) against Jehovah.
31 The horse is made ready for the day of battle,
but from Jehovah is the victory.

GRAMMATICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 3.—The Infinitive form עֲשֹׂה like קְנֹה in chap. xvi. 16.

Ver. 4.—Hitzig writes נִב (=נִיב, sprout or shoot) instead of נִר and translates the second clause: "The fruit of the wicked [*i. e.*, pride] bringeth to destruction"—an emendation plainly not less unfortunate than the corresponding one, נִיב for נִיר, which he proposed in chap. xiii. 23. Compare notes on this passage. [The shortening of the long vowel in נִיר is undoubtedly facilitated by the initial ר of the following word.]

Ver. 6.—הֶבֶל cannot be *stat. constr.*, for it would be separated from its genitive by the adjective נִדָּף.—Ewald, Bertheau, *etc.*, read with the LXX and Vulg.: מוֹקְשֵׁי instead of מְבַקְשֵׁי and render "snares of death" instead of "seekers of death." Hitzig, in addition, proposes רֹדֵף instead of נִדָּף, as well as in clause *a* פֹּעֵל instead of פֹּעַל, so that he reaches the meaning (which corresponds pretty closely with the LXX and Vulg.): "He that getteth treasures by a lying tongue runneth after vanity into snares of death."

Ver. 7.—מֵאֲנוּ is one of Böttcher's "relative" perfects; they have before this destruction, be it earlier or later, refused, *etc.*—See § 950, 1.—A.]

Ver. 8.—הֲפַכְפַּךְ, "winding, crooked" (as נֶהְפָּךְ is elsewhere used, comp. xvii. 20) is not *stat. constr.* (Bertheau, "one crooked in his way"), but a predicate for emphasis prefixed to its subject דֶּרֶךְ, as the parallelism shows.—וְזַךְ at the beginning of clause *b* seems to be purposely chosen to correspond with וָזָר at the end of clause *a*. Comp. זָךְ in chap. xx. 11. [This וָזָר is one of the very few words in Hebrew in which an initial ו remains, not being weakened into י. It seems to be an ancient judicial term, and etymologically corresponds with the familiar Arabic word *Vizier;* comp. also *Chargé d' Affaires.* See Bött., Fuerst, *etc.*—A.]

Ver. 9.—[טוֹב לָשֶׁבֶת a masculine predicative adjective notwithstanding the fem. form of the Infinitive. Bött., § 990, 3, *β*.—A.]

Ver. 10.—[Bött. strongly maintains the existence of a Passive of the Kal. conj., and cites יֻחַן as one of the examples. See § 906, *c*. As is well known, it has usually been called a Hophal form; no Hiphil forms are in use, and this is in meaning an exact passive counterpart to the Kal.—A.]

Ver. 14.—Instead of יִכְפֶּה (from כָּפָה, a verb occurring only here, which must mean "to bend or beat down"), Hitzig proposes to read, with Symmachus, the Vulg. and Targ. יְכַבֶּה "extinguishes."

Digitized by Google

Ver. 22.—The ה in מִבְטֶחָה without Mappiq, on account of the distinctive accent; comp. Jer. vi. 6; Is. xxiii. 17, 18; xlv. 6, *etc.*—[עָלָה one of BÖTTCHER's "*empirical* Perfects;" it has been a matter of experience; see §950, 3.—A.]

Ver. 28.—HITZIG, partially following the LXX (changing לָנֶצַח to לְנֵצֶר, and שׁוֹמֵעַ to שָׂמֵחַ), amends thus: The man that rejoiceth to deliver (! ?) shall speak.

EXEGETICAL.

1. Ver. 1–3. Of God's all directing providence and government.—**Like streams of water is the heart of a king in Jehovah's hand.**—The *tertium comp.* is, according to the second member of the parallelism, the capability in the "streams of water" of being directed and guided at pleasure,—the allusion being to the canals and ditches constructed for the irrigation and fertilizing of meadows, gardens and fields. [See HACKETT's *Illustrations of Scripture*, and similar works; also HORACE, *Od.* III., 1, 5–8.—A.] Since for the accomplishment of their object there must always be a number of them, the plural "streams" is used, although only one king's heart is spoken of. Whether in the second line the pleasant, refreshing influence of the rivulets, dispensing blessing and increase, comes into account as a point in the comparison is uncertain (comp. Is. xxxii. 2): this, however, is not improbable, inasmuch as the heart of a king may in fact become in an eminent degree a fountain of blessing for many thousands, and according to God's design ought to be so. See also the comparison of royal favor with a "cloud of the harvest rain," in chap. xvi. 15, and in the opposite direction comp. xx. 2, 8, 26.

Ver. 2. Almost precisely like xvi. 2; comp. also xiv. 12; xvi. 25. [FUERST, unlike most others, renders the verb of the second clause "determineth," *i. e.*, determines the direction,—instead of "weighing, trying," or the old English term of our E. V., "pondereth."—A.]

Ver. 3. **To do justice and judgment is more acceptable to Jehovah than sacrifice.** Comp. xv. 8; Ps. l. 7 sq.; 1 Sam. xv. 22; Mich. vi. 6–8.—For this combination of righteousness and justice comp. besides, *e. g.*, 2 Sam. viii. 15; Jeremiah ix. 23. For the נִבְחָר "more acceptable," lit., "chosen," *i. e.*, desired, well-pleasing, valuable, comp. xxii. 1; and also viii. 10, 19. ["This maxim of the Proverbs was a bold saying then,—it is a bold saying still; but it well unites the wisdom of Solomon with that of his father David in the 51st Psalm, and with the inspiration of the later prophets." STANLEY, *Jewish Church*, II., 257].

2. Vers. 4–9. Against pride, avarice, deceit, violence, and vicious dispositions in general.—**Haughty eyes and a proud heart**; lit. "to be lofty of eyes and to be swollen of heart," for רוּם and רְחַב are infinitives. "Swelling of heart" is however here and in Ps. ci. 5, where it stands again in connection with "loftiness of eyes," a proud, arrogant disposition chastened by no care; comp. also Isa. lx. 5; Ps. cxix. 32.—**The light of the wicked is only sin.** נֵר רְשָׁעִים, which is plainly an appositive to "haughty eyes and a proud heart," may be translated either by "the fallow, or newly ploughed land of the wicked" (comp. נִיר, chap. xiii. 23), and refer to "the very first fruits of a man's activity (so EWALD, ELSTER, *etc.*), or, which is surely preferable, it may be taken as meaning the same as נֵר (comp. 1 Kings xi. 36, where instead of נֵר we find נִיר in the sense of "light"), and in accordance with chap. xx. 27, it may be regarded as a figurative representation of the entire spirit of the wicked, *i. e.* their proud disposition, flaring and flaming like a bright light. Thus the LXX (λαμπτήρ), Vulg., SCHULTENS, DATHE, BERTHEAU — except that the latter interpret the "light" less pertinently of the brilliant prosperity of the wicked. In like manner LUTHER also, GEIER, DÖDERLEIN, ZIEGLER, UMBREIT, who, however, find in the last term not an appositive to the two preceding expressions, but a third subject co-ordinate with them. [To these who adopt "light" as their rendering, may be added, although with some diversity in the grammatical relation and the interpretation of the term, K., DE W., H., S., M., N., and the E. V. in its marginal reading. The old English expositors generally follow the text of the E. V., "ploughing," which is also preferred and defended by WORDSW., as suggesting an "evil execution" of the "proud aspirations and covetous ambition" of the wicked "in a deliberate action."—A.].—The predicate of clause *b* is with no more propriety here than in chap. x. 16 to be explained by "ruin" (disaster, destruction),—which is contrary to the view of UMBREIT, HITZIG, *etc.*,—but retains the meaning which is predominant in the Old Testament; for to trace back all proud conduct and action to *sin* is plainly the proper drift and import of the proverb before us; comp. ver. 24, below.

Ver. 5. **The counsels of the diligent** (tend) **only to abundance; but every one who is overhasty** (cometh) **only to want.** "Abundance" and "want" stand contrasted here as in xiv. 23. The "hasty," however, in contrast with the "diligent," the man who labors in substantial and continuous methods (comp. xii. 27), must be he who in the pursuit of gain is in excessive haste, the impatient, restless fortune-hunter, who besides is not above base and deceitful modes of acquiring, and for that very reason for a punishment is plunged into destitution and penury; comp. xix. 2; also xx. 21; xxviii. 20; and with respect to the general sentiment still further xii. 11; xiii. 11.—This explanation, which is as simple as it is congruous with the context, makes HITZIG's conjecture superfluous (instead of אָץ, אֹצֵר, "the collector," *i. e.* the niggard); comp. xi. 24. [RUEETSCHI, *ubi supra*, p. 152, defending the common rendering, expands somewhat the implied contrast between the *plans* according to which the diligent toils, and the *impatient haste* which cannot wait to plan.—A.].

Ver. 6. **The getting of treasures by a lying tongue is a fleeting breath of them that seek death.** The second member is literally rendered according to the text: "is fleet-

Digitized by Google

ing breath, those seeking death,"—the latter phrase not to be regarded as a limiting genitive (see Critical Notes), but the two a *hendiadys;* the idea "fleeting breath of those seeking death" being resolved into the two co-ordinate ideas, "fleeting breath" and "seekers of death." [Wordsw.: "*vanity driven like chaff;*"—"the *work* of the wicked and covetous man is *chaff* and his harvest is *death.*" Kamph., while favoring a simple emendation (that of Ewald, *etc.;* see Critical Notes), would refer the "seekers," if the text is to be retained, to the *treasures;* "treasures unlawfully gained are not only themselves without substance, but also bring on destruction for their deceitful possessor." H.: "a vanity agitated by them that seek death;" N.: "scattered breath of them," *etc.;* S.: "a fleeting breath are they who seek death;" M.: "(like) a fleeting vapor to those who seek death." The phrase plainly requires somewhat violent grammatical constructions, or an emendation. Our author's *hendiadys* making the plural participle an *apparent* appositive of the singular noun is not the most forced.—A.] With reference to the phrase "seekers of death," comp. viii. 36; xvii. 19; with respect to the expression "a fleeting vanity," Job xiv. 2; xiii. 25; and Pindar's well-known phrase, σκιᾶς ὄναρ ἄνθρωπος. It is hardly possible that we have here any suggestion of the mirage (Isa. xxxv. 7), the "tremulous mist of the desert, vanishing again in quick deception,"—for the noun הֶבֶל nowhere else occurs with this signification (this in opposition to Arnoldi, and to some extent Umbreit also).

Ver. 7. **The violence of the wicked sweepeth them away.** The "violence" is not designed here to describe the destruction intended for the wicked (comp. Job v. 22; Isa. xiii. 6), but is used in the active sense, of the rapacious or murderous violence practised by them (comp. xxiv. 2. So the Vulg., Luther, Umbreit, Hitzig.) The latter, to illustrate the idea, appropriately suggests the case in which an incendiary is consumed in the fire which he sets. But examples like i. 18, 19; vii. 23; serve also for illustration. With clause *b* compare (above) ver. 3, *a.*

Ver. 8. **Crooked is the way of the guilty man.** "Burdened, laden" signifies, as the corresponding word in Arabic does, "the guilt-laden," and so the vicious man, the malefactor, in contrast with the "pure or clean."

3. Vers. 9-18. Various warnings against foolish, hard-hearted, uncharitable, unrighteous conduct.—**It is better to dwell in a corner of the housetop,** and so on the one hand, solitary and forsaken (comp. Ps. cii. 7 (8)), and on the other, exposed to all winds and weathers, in an exceedingly inconvenient, uncomfortable position. [See Hackett's *Illustrations of Scripture,* and similar works].—**Than with a contentious woman in a thronged house:** lit., "than a woman of contentions (comp. xix. 13; xxvii. 15) and a house of companionship" (οἶκος κοινός, LXX),—an example of *hendiadys,* therefore like ver. 6.—On account of the correspondence of the idea with ver. 19, which certainly is remarkably close, Hitzig proposes to remove the "contentious woman" entirely from the text, for (freely following the LXX) he reads כְּמַשְׂאֵת instead of מִשְׂאֵת, and so from clause *b* gets the meaning: "than that strife arises and the house is common."

Ver. 10. For the expression in *a* comp. xiii. 4.—**His neighbor findeth no mercy with him,** lit., "his neighbor is not compassionately treated by his eyes," *i. e.,* on account of his violent wickedness and selfishness even his friend experiences no sympathy from him.

Ver. 11. With *a* comp. xix. 25.—**And when the wise is prospered, he will gain knowledge,** *i. e.* the simple, who must be the subject again in clause *b,* inasmuch as it can hardly be said of the wise that it is his prosperity that first helps him to knowledge. Usually, "and if one instruct the wise," as if the verb הַשְׂכִּיל were here transitive in the sense of "warning, instructing," and thus stood for הוֹכִיחַ, xix. 25. But the wise man needs no longer such instruction as may for the first time give him understanding; and this verb is found, *e. g.* also in Prov. xvii. 8 (comp. Isa. lii. 13), used in the sense of "possessing or finding prosperity." The whole proverb therefore demands that "the simple" be deterred by the punishment of the fool, as well as made intelligent and stimulated to good by the prosperity of the wise.

Ver. 12. **The Righteous marketh the house of the wicked.** That by this righteous one God is meant, the supreme judge and rewarder, appears beyond all controversy from clause *b,* as well as from the parallel passage xxii. 12 (comp. also Job xxxiv. 17). Rosenmueller, Ewald, Bertheau, Elster take the correct view, while Hitzig here again endeavors to emend (substituting בֵּיתוֹ for בֵּית, and making רֶשַׁע, "wickedness," the subject of clause *b*); Umbreit, however, harshly and ungrammatically makes the "righteous" in *a* a righteous man, and then in *b* supplies God as the subject of the predicative participle. [So the E. V., which is followed by Wordsw.; Noyes makes the righteous man the subject of both clauses,—while De W., K., H., S. and M. more correctly refer both to God.—A.]

Ver. 13. Comp. Matt. xviii. 23-35, a parable which fitly illustrates the meaning of this sentence, pronounced against hard-heartedness; see also Matt. xxv. 41 sq.; Luke xi. 13.

Ver. 14. Comp. xvii. 8; xviii. 16; xix. 6. As in these passages so in the one before us it is not prohibited presents or bribes that are spoken of, but lawful manifestations of liberality, though bestowed in all quietness (in secret), *i. e.* without attracting needless attention.—**A present in the bosom,** is the same as the "gift from the bosom" in chap. xvii. 23, a present brought concealed in the bosom (not a "present *into* the bosom," as Rosenm., Bertheau, *etc.,* would have it).

Ver. 15. **It is a joy to the just to do justice, but (it is) destruction only to them that work iniquity.** "Confusion, terror" (comp. x. 29) is all right action to evil doers, since they distinctly feel "that its consequences must condemn and punish their own course and con-

Digitized by Google

duct" (ELSTER); for they practise their ungodly folly with pleasure and delight (x. 23; xv. 21); they have a real satisfaction in their works of darkness (comp. Rom. i. 32; John iii. 19). [The E. V., followed by H., N., S., M. makes "destruction" the subject of clause *b*, and not a second predicate, as DE W., K., *etc.*, do, like our author. The latter construction best brings out the antithesis between a "joy" and a "terror." The same course of conduct is thus differently viewed by and related to the contrasted classes. —A.]

Ver. 16. With *a* compare ii. 15; iv. 14 sq.; with *b*, ii. 18; ix. 18.

Ver. 17. **He becometh a poor man who loveth pleasure** (lit. "a man of want"). "Joy" is here specifically intoxicating delights, such as are to be found in luxurious banquets, where "wine and perfume," these familiar symbols of social festivity (Ps. civ. 15; Prov. xxvii. 9; comp. Amos vi. 6), play their part. The Vulgate, therefore, if not with verbal accuracy renders by "*qui diligit epulas*."

Ver. 18. **The wicked becometh a ransom for the righteous**, *i. e.* so far forth as the divine wrath turns from him who is comparatively righteous to fall upon the head of the evil doer; comp. xi. 8. Thus according to Isa. xliii. 3 the heathen nations atone for the comparatively purer and more upright Israel (comp. HITZIG on this passage).

4. Vers. 19–25. Admonitions of an import similar to that of the preceding series, directed especially against uncharitableness, folly and sloth.—With ver. 19 comp. ver. 9 above.—**With a contentious, fretful woman**, lit., "with a woman of contentions and of worry;" the genitives are naturally *genitivi effectus*.

Ver. 20. **Precious treasure and oil are in the dwelling of the wise, but a foolish man consumeth them**, *i. e.* wastes whatever he possesses of valuable treasures and spices. "A fool of a man," as in xv. 20. To "swallow up," *i. e.* to waste, destroy and ruin, as in Eccles. x. 12; Lam. ii. 2-8; Job x. 8, *etc.*—HITZIG in clause *a* changes וְשֶׁמֶן to שֶׁכֵּן and reads פֶּה instead of נְוֵה, and thus obtains the meaning, "Precious treasure is in a wise mouth, but a fool of a man swallows it down (?)."

Ver. 21. **He that followeth after righteousness and mercy shall find life, righteousness and honor.** The second "righteousness," although wanting in the LXX, is not for that reason to be regarded an error (in opposition to ZIEGLER, ELSTER). It denotes the *judicial* righteousness of the man who, on account of his striving after righteousness, is sanctified and blessed by God (just as in chap. viii. 18; Job xxxiii. 26),—while in clause *a* the righteousness intended is a moral quality of the wise man who keeps the law. The relation is the same in the N. T. between *δικαιοσύνη* as a present possession of the believer (*e. g.* Rom. iii. 28; Gal. iii. 21), and *δικαιοσύνη* as an object of Christian hope; Gal. v. 5.—With this use of the terms "life" and "honor" comp. iii. 16.

Ver. 22. **A wise man scaleth a city of the mighty**; *i. e.* even a fortress well defended by numerous and strong warriors does not long withstand the sagacious counsel of the wise; comp. xxiv. 5, and also Eccles. ix. 15,—where, in a reversed relation, one wise man successfully defends the city against a whole army.—For the expression, "the bulwark of its confidence," in clause *b*, comp. xiv. 26.

Ver. 23. Comp. xiii. 3; xix. 6.

Ver. 24. **A proud and arrogant** (man)—**scorner is his name**; *i. e.* not, "he might reasonably be called scoffer," but, "the universal moral judgment of men really calls him so, looks upon him as a scoffer, as an 'infidel' (DELITZSCH; comp. Introd., § 3, N. 2), a man to whom there is nothing holy." For יָהִיר, *superbiens*, "arrogant, conceited," comp. Hab. ii. 5.

Vers. 25 and 26 form a continuous representation of the slothful, in contrast with the righteous and therefore diligent man, who, however, on account of his diligence is also beneficent.—**The desire of the slothful killeth him**, *i. e.* his desire for food and drink, his hunger, for the quieting of which he is nevertheless unable to employ the proper means—labor in behalf of his physical sustenance. Comp. xiii. 4; also xix. 24. [STUART understands "his desire of slothful repose;" which is less easily reconciled with clause *a* of ver. 26. His desires are not so intense and consuming for repose, passivity rather than activity characterizing whatever is voluntary about him; his involuntary appetites, for which he neglects to provide, destroy him.—A.] —**He desireth intensely all the day long**; lit., "Every day he wisheth a wish." *i. e.* he carries constantly the same intense longing for possession and enjoyment, but stops with this indolent wishing and dreaming, without passing over into energetic action. It is otherwise with the upright, who by his honorable industry is put in circumstances to distribute rich gifts among others also; comp. xi. 24 *a*.

5. Vers. 27-31. Of God's righteous judgment on the wicked and disobedient.—**The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination** (comp. xv. 8), **how much more when it is offered for evil.** בְזִמָּה might mean "with transgression, with evil intent" (not "with deceit," as BERTHEAU holds), comp. Ps. xxvi. 10; cxix. 150. But it seems to be more appropriately taken here as a statement of the motive of the abhorred sacrifice, and therefore to be "for transgression," for some iniquity wrought with evil intent, which is to be expiated by a sacrifice,—and by a sacrifice only, and not by true contrition and repentance (comp. HITZIG on this passage). Mal. i. 13 is therefore not so true a parallel as Ecclesiast. xxxiv. 21-25.

Ver. 28. With *a* comp. xix. 5, 9.—**The man that heareth shall speak evermore**; *i. e.* the modest and teachable, who, instead of talking on heedlessly at random, gives thoughtful attention to all profitable teaching, and ponders quietly all that he has heard, that he may be able to give reliable testimony (comp. Solomon's "hearing heart," 1 Kings iii. 9)—such a one will be constantly called forth anew to testify, and so become one "speaking evermore," a *testis sive orator perpetuus*, a witness to the truth universally esteemed and much desired, in contrast with the heedless, gossiping, lying witness (comp. xviii.

Digitized by Google

18). For this interpretation the parallel in xii. 19 is decisive, from which appears especially the inadmissibility of rendering לָנֶצַח *secundum veritatem*, according to truth (so *e. g.* UMBREIT: "he who hears the truth"). [RUEETSCHI (as above, p. 152) brings out the antithetic force of the verse thus: "To hold to the truth is just what the lying witness fails to do; therefore must he cease to speak; his way perishes, Ps. i. 6. But the man that hearkens, *etc.*, to the truth shall evermore speak 'as a witness and otherwise, living happily shall always be able to speak, and shall be gladly heard' (EWALD), and so by no means perish."—A.]

Ver. 29. **The wicked putteth on a bold face**, lit., "the man of wickedness maketh boldness with his face." The predicate as in vii. 13, denotes the immovable fixedness of features behind which the shameless villain seeks to hide his criminal intentions and crafty dispositions. Whether we are here to think specifically of a false witness implicated in some criminal conspiracy (from the suggestion of 28, *a*), must remain doubtful from the indefiniteness of the expression (in opposition to BERTHEAU, HITZIG).—**But he that is upright establisheth his way.** Instead of יָכִין the K'ri, with which the LXX agree, proposes יָבִין, and some modern interpreters prefer this reading, *e. g.* HITZIG: "considereth his way." But just as it may be said of God (chap. xvi. 9) so it might be said of a pious man, that he makes his way or his steps *firm*, *i. e.* sure and fixed (comp. Jotham's example, 2 Chron. xxvii. 6); and the antithesis between *a* and *b* becomes decidedly stronger with the reading of the K'thibh. [The E. V., which is followed by H., N. and M. adopts a weakened and ambiguous rendering, "directeth,"—"considereth" being in the margin. S. and WORDSW. decidedly prefer the stronger rendering "establisheth," W. bringing out the contrast between the wicked man's *hardening* his face, and the good man's *hardening* his way. As RUEETSCHI urges, both the verbs and their objects contribute to the completeness of the antithesis. "The wicked man looks only to the outside, the forms, the appearance and show, the transient result; but the good man aims at the real, the actually good; he therefore establishes his ways, his mode of life and action, his whole course."—A.].

Ver. 30. **No wisdom, no understanding, no counsel is there against Jehovah.** לְנֶגֶד is by no means merely "before God," *i. e.*, according to God's judgment, as UMBREIT, *etc.*, say, but "over against, in opposition to." The meaning is that a human wisdom which would assert itself in opposition to the divine, is not wisdom, but sheer folly (comp. 1 Cor. iii. 19), that in comparison with the divine wisdom that of man is altogether nought (comp. Isa. xxix. 14).

Ver. 31 continues the thought of the preceding verse. As human wisdom, so likewise is human strength and reliance on human aid and might nothing; comp. Ps. xx. 7 (8); xxxiii. 17.—**The horse is made ready for the day of battle.** The participle expresses the permanence of the matter; therefore, lit. "stands prepared, is prepared" (HITZIG).—With *b* compare also David's language to Goliath, 1 Sam. xvii. 47: "The battle is Jehovah's;" *i. e.*, on Him depends the decision of the war, its favorable issue, its victorious result.

DOCTRINAL, ETHICAL, HOMILETIC AND PRACTICAL.

According to the introduction and conclusion of the chapter, its contents refer mainly to the all-directing providence of God, the ruler of the world, just as in chap. xvi.,—which furthermore in regard to several of the ethical precepts, or rules of virtue connected with these considerations about providence, stands in quite close relations to the admonitory substance of the section before us; comp. *e. g.* xvi. 5 with xxi. 4, 24; xvi. 10, 12 with xxi. 1; xvi. 11 with xxi. 6; xvi. 6 with xxi. 21; xvi. 17, 20 with xxi. 28; xvi. 32 with xxi. 22; xvi. 26 with xxi. 25, 26. Among the virtues the practice of which is commended as a chief means of putting one's self in the right relations to the administrative and judicial government of God over the world, *righteousness* or *obedience* to God's word, which is better than sacrifice (vers. 3, 27; comp. vers. 8, 12, 15, 18, 21, 28, 29), is the most conspicuous. Side by side with this stands patience in the sense of the New Testament (comp. ὑπομονή, Luke viii. 15; James i. 4), *i. e.*, steadfast endurance in labor and in suffering, such as the service of the Lord brings with it (vers. 5, 17, 25, 26). There are more isolated warnings against deception (vers. 6, 28), hard-heartedness (vers. 10, 13), luxurious extravagance (ver. 17, 20), scoffing (vers. 11, 24). Since however these without difficulty group themselves about the central idea of obedience to the divine command, this obedience may itself be considered in a general way as the controlling idea in the substance of the section, and accordingly some such theme as "the man who hearkens" (ver. 28; comp. 1 Kings iii. 9), or again "obedience more acceptable to God than sacrifice" (ver. 3; comp. 1 Sam. xv. 22), may be prefixed as a theme or motto to all the rest.

For a *homily* then *on the chapter as a whole:* God as ruler and judge over all the world, and man's duty of obedience to Him, consisting in walking in righteousness, patience, love, and truth. Or more briefly: Obedience to God's word as the sum of all human duties and virtues. Comp. STÖCKER: Of God's gracious and righteous government, as it shows itself in the good and the evil.—The *Berleburg Bible* puts it very well: God is to rule, not self-will.

Vers. 1-8. CRAMER (on vers. 1, 2): God not only knows the thoughts of men, but also has their hearts in His hands, and turns and moulds them as the potter the clay. In matters of faith therefore we are not to proceed according to the fancy of our own hearts, but according to God's command.—GEIER: Pray God earnestly that He may not leave thine heart intent on any evil, but that he may draw it to Himself to walk steadfastly according to his word.—WOHLFARTH: Not merely the plans of the lowly, but also the counsels and undertakings of the mighty depend on God, who as chief ruler of His world with wisdom that never deceives and power that never fails shapes all according to His design.—STARKE

Digitized by Google

(on ver. 3): All outward ceremonies of worship avail nothing, if there is lacking the true inward service of God, worshipping God in spirit and in truth (John iv. 24).—[LAWSON: Sacrifices had no goodness in their own nature; and when men rested on them they were abominable to God. Judgment and justice are a part of the image of God in man, and have an everlasting excellency in their nature].

Vers. 4-8. CRAMER (on ver. 5): A measure is good in all things; therefore hasten deliberately. —GEIER: He is cruel against himself who heaps up riches unrighteously: he is gathering up his own ruin at the same time.—*Calwer Handb.* (on vers. 5-7): Industry and activity, not excess of haste, leads to good success; furthermore, not falsehood, or deceit, or robbing others.—VON GERLACH (on 7, 8): The desolation which the ungodly bring upon others at length sweeps them away; for no one, who persistently refuses to do right can stand, since right is precisely the stability, the order of things.—[TRAPP (on ver. 6): Many a wretched worldling spins a fair thread to strangle himself both temporally and eternally].

Vers. 9-18. [CHALMERS (on ver. 10): The claims of friendship are overborne by the strength of that evil desire on the part of the wicked, which is bent on the objects of their own selfishness] —STARKE (on ver. 10): We should not so often act contrary to the law of love to our neighbors, if we reflected always what we should desire in our neighbor's place (Matth. vii. 12).—(On ver. 13): An uncompassionate spirit toward the poor is punished by God with want of pity in return, according to the justice of an exact requital.—HASIUS (on ver. 14): Even with trifles, with slight manifestations of love, one may frequently avert much evil, and soothe spirits.—GEIER (on ver. 15): Joy and peace of conscience follow a joyful obedience to God's command; a scornful contempt and disobedience of it is followed by constant disquiet and fear.—[LAWSON (on ver. 15): Many do judgment without taking pleasure in it; their consciences will not suffer them to do otherwise, but their hearts are on the side of sin; or they will do many good things with pleasure, because their constitutional and beloved sins are not affected by them; but there are other things at which they stop short, *etc.*—TRAPP (on ver. 16): He that deviateth from the truth according to godliness cannot possibly wander so far as to miss of hell].—CRAMER (on ver. 17): He who will consume more than his plough can yield must utterly perish (Ecclesiast. xix. 32).—(On ver. 18): God often turns the leaf over so that the evil that was designed for the pious comes upon the ungodly.—VON GERLACH (on ver. 18): Every man deserves punishment here since none is guiltless. Since however the righteous acknowledges his guilt and walks in humility before the Lord, He remits his penalty, and before his eyes punishes the ungodly in full measure, that by the sight he may be made wise.

Vers. 19-26. HASIUS (on ver. 20): Where true wisdom is lacking in the administration of temporal things, there even with a regal or princely income destitution and want may enter.—GEIER (on ver. 22): Let every Christian and especially every Christian teacher exert himself by virtue of heavenly wisdom to tear down the fortresses and bulwarks of the kingdom of hell.—CRAMER (on ver. 22): Let no one trust in walls, castles or fortresses. What human hands have constructed human hands can pull down again.—(On ver. 23): God as the Creator of our human nature has set a double wall before the tongue, —the teeth and the lips,—to show that we should keep and guard the tongue with all carefulness. —[BP. HALL: He that looketh carefully to his tongue takes a safe course for preserving his life, which is oft in danger by much and wild talking].—GEIER (on ver. 24): Vices hang together like a chain; from pride springs contempt, from contempt wrath, from wrath mockery and many insults.—ZELTNER (on ver. 25, 26): Lazy thieves of time are not worth their bread; he that worketh not, neither shall he eat, 2 Thess. iii. 10.—[MUFFET: Wishers and woulders are neither good householders nor yet long livers].

Vers. 27-31. ZELTNER (on vers. 28, 29): To receive kind suggestions with thankfulness, and to reform, is no shame but an honor in the sight of God and men.—[TRAPP (on ver. 30): Human wisdom while it strives for masteries is overmastered].—MELANCHTHON (on ver. 30, 31): It is a wholesome rule for the whole of life, to fulfil the duties of one's calling, and in connection with this trustfully to invoke God's aid and succor. If we do this our works under God's aid in blessing us succeed well. Unrighteous labors, those undertaken without any call from above, as well as without trust in and prayer to God, on the contrary undoubtedly fail, be they entered upon with ever so much shrewdness and cunning.—SAURIN (sermon on ver. 30): On the futility of the means which human passions oppose to God,—*viz.* 1) earthly exaltation; 2) political prudence; 3) sensuality; 4) stoical endurance. —*Berleburg Bible* (on vers. 30, 31): No beginning, devising, striving of ours can possibly oppose that which God purposes with us. Is it not then the best thing to commit ourselves wholly to His guidance, without giving ourselves much labor in vain? We indeed prepare all in accordance with our idea and understanding; but God gives success wholly according to His will. In everything then let the charge be left to Him!

Digitized by Google

η) Admonition to secure and keep a good name.

CHAP. XXII. 1–16.

1 A (good) name is to be chosen rather than great riches;
better than silver and gold is good will.
2 The rich and the poor meet together;
Jehovah is the maker of them all.
3 The prudent seeth the evil and hideth himself,
but the simple pass on and must suffer.
4 The end of humility (and) of the fear of God
is riches, honor and life.
5 Thorns, snares are in the way of the wayward;
he that guardeth his soul let him keep far from them.
6 Train up a child in the way he should go;
even when he is old he doth not depart from it.
7 The rich ruleth over the poor,
and the borrower becometh servant to the lender.
8 He that soweth iniquity shall reap calamity,
and the staff of his haughtiness shall vanish away.
9 He that hath a bountiful eye shall be blessed,
for he giveth of his bread to the poor.
10 Chase away the scorner and contention goeth out,
and strife and reproach cease.
11 He that loveth with a pure heart,
whose lips are gracious, the King is his friend.
12 The eyes of Jehovah preserve knowledge,
but the words of the false doth He overthrow.
13 The slothful saith: (There is) a lion without,
I shall be slain in the streets.
14 A deep pit is the mouth of the strange woman;
he that is accursed by Jehovah falleth into it.
15 Foolishness is bound in the heart of the child;
the rod of correction driveth it far from him.
16 One oppresseth the poor only to make him rich;
one giveth to the rich (and it tendeth) only to want.

GRAMMATICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. [The Niphal part. נִבְחָר here as in xvi. 16 is to be rendered like the Latin pass. periphr.—*ndus est*, "is to be chosen, ought to be chosen;" comp. BÖTT, § 997, 2, *c*.—A.].

Ver. 2. [See Exeg. notes for the reason why כֻּלָּם is preferred to שְׁנֵיהֶם. The lit. rendering is "their totality, the whole of them." For minute explanations of the use of כֹּל and the ordinary form of its suffixes see *e. g.*, BÖTT. § 876, *c*, § 883, *d*.—A.].

Ver. 3. [See Exeg. notes for reasons why the K'thibh is to be preferred to the K'ri. The vocalization is of course that of the K'ri נִסְתָּר and not that of an Imperf. Kal. The time implied in the verb רָאָה is of course a "relative perfect;" he *hath* first seen, and then *will* hide himself.—A.].

Ver. 5. עִקֵּשׁ is in the Vulg. correctly regarded as a genitive with דֶּרֶךְ; so most of the modern interpreters regard it.

Vers. 7, 8. [The full forms יִמְשׁוֹל and יִקְצוֹר (K'thibh) are preserved by the emphasis thrown on the ultimate syllables. According to BÖTT. § 1005, 5, *c*, while these forms are the prevalent forms in the dialects of Ephraim and Simeon they are found in the period of Judah only under the influence of special emphasis or a following pause.—A.].

Ver. 11. [In the reading of the K'ri the Hholem is exceptionally shortened to Kamets-Hhatuph before Makkeph. The K'thibh has the *stat. constr.* in its ordinary form. See GREEN, § 215, 1, *c*.—A.].

Vers. 12, 13. [The perf. נִצְּרוּ in ver. 12 is classed by BÖTT. with the "empirical" perfects; this is a fact of experience, it has been found true; the אָמַר of ver. 13 is classed with the "effective" perfects: he has virtually said, it is in effect as though he had said, *etc.*—A.]

Digitized by Google

Ver. 15. [The pass. part. קְשׁוּרָה illustrates the principle that in Hebrew, whatever be the time to which this participle relates it describes a state and not a process,—something that is, and not something that is coming to be; Germ. "*ist verknupft*" not "*wird v.*" See Bött. § 997, 2, *c.*—A.].

[It can hardly be accidental that in this group of proverbs so many of the important words begin with ע; thus עֹשֶׁר (ver. 1), עָשִׁיר and עֹשֵׂה (ver. 2), עָרוּם (ver. 3), עֵקֶב and עֲנָוָה (ver. 4) עִקֵּשׁ (ver. 5), *etc.*—A.].

EXEGETICAL.

1. On account of the brevity of this section beginning with chap. xxii. 1, but plainly ending with ver. 16, as well as on account of the supposed construction of the section with some reference to the number *five* (which is said to have had a modifying influence also on chap. xxi.), Hitzig conjectures that its latter and larger half has been lost, and thinks that the portion which has disappeared may be recognized in the section xxviii. 17—xxix. 27. All this rests on the basis of assumptions as subjective and arbitrary as the general principles of this critic which relate to the supposed numerical structure of the oldest and main division of the whole collection of proverbs. See remarks below, on chap. xxv. 1, and also on xxviii. 1 (Doctrinal and Ethical).

2. Vers. 1-5. On a good name as dependent not on riches and treasures, but on prudence, humility and right sensibilities.—**A (good) name is more precious than great riches.** The absolute term "name" here denotes, like ὄνομα in the parallel passage, Ecclesiast. xli. 12, a *good* name (ὄνομα καλὸν, LXX); so likewise in Eccles. vii. 1; Job xxx. 8.—**Better than silver and gold is goodwill.** The "good" (טוֹב) does not belong as an adjective [attributive] to the noun "favor" (as the Rabbins render, and Umbreit also: "*Schöne Gunst*" [E. V., M., S., De W., *etc*]), but is a predicate (comp. viii. 19), parallel with "more precious, or choice," but put at the end of its clause for the sake of a more emphatic stress upon the objects compared with it, gold and silver. [So E. V. in the margin. Wordsw. (?), H., N., K., *etc.*].

Ver. 2. **The rich and the poor meet together**; *i. e.*, they are found side by side (comp. xxix. 13; Isa. xxxiv. 14), as classes both of which are alike created by Jehovah, and therefore have each its own peculiar object and calling to fulfil in God's creation. Comp. xiv. 31; xvii. 5; Job xxxi. 15.—Since both "rich" and "poor" are collective ideas, it is said that God has created "all of them" (כֻּלָּם, and not "both of them, or the two," שְׁנֵיהֶם, as in xx. 12). [The verb "strike against, or encounter each other," of course does not here imply such an antagonism as too often exists in disordered human society, but simply the ordinary encounter or intermixture of social life. The word of God no where endorses the jealousies and collisions that result from sin.—A]

Ver. 3. **The prudent seeth the evil and hideth himself.**—The K'thibh (יִסָּתֵר, an Imperf. Niph.) is to be preferred to the K'ri (וְנִסְתָּר), because the hiding one's self is a consequence of seeing the coming calamity, and this consequence is expressed by the Imperf. with ו *consec.*; comp. 1 Sam. xix. 5. The K'ri originates from xxvii. 12, where the verse, with this exception, literally recurs.

But the simple pass on and must suffer ("are punished," E. V. and most of the English commentators). In the last verb we have a perfect preceded by a simple copula, because the heedless pressing on of the simple into calamity, and their "expiating" it, or suffering injury, are conceived of as cotemporaneous; compare 2 Sam. vii. 9; Ezek. xxv. 12, *etc.*—The plural "the simple ones" over against the one "prudent man" of clause *a*, seems to be chosen not without an intentional reference to the disproportion that actually exists numerically in life between the two classes of men.

Ver. 4. **The end of humility (and) of the fear of God is riches and honor and life.**—The copula is wanting before "the fear of God," because this "fear" is in its idea so closely connected with "humility" that it can be appended as in a sense an appositive to it. Thus Bertheau and Elster correctly render, following Geier, Rosenmueller, Schelling, *etc.* More commonly (and as early as the LXX and Vulg.) the "fear of Jehovah" is regarded as the first effect or consequence of humility, like riches, honor and life; this, however, gives no specifically appropriate idea. This is also true of Hitzig's emendation (רְאוּת for יִרְאַת), the "beholding Jehovah;" for "riches, honor and life" could hardly be the elements into which the "beholding Jehovah" should be resolved; this idea is rather in the Old Testament also (*e. g.*, Ps. xi. 7; xvii. 15) always one that belongs not to the present, but only to the future life —With *b* compare moreover iii. 16; viii. 18.—[Our author's idea is also that of De W. and K., the E. V., H., N., S., M., Wordsw., *etc.* The grammatical objection urged by Hitzig, Umbreit and Rueetschi is the harshness of the *asyndeton*; they agree in making the latter part of clause *a* the predicate, a more natural construction unquestionably, if the resulting meaning is admissible. Umbreit interprets the humility of which "the fear of God" is the reward, as humility in human relations—a rendering hardly consistent with the Hebrew *usus loquendi*. Rueetschi takes the words in their ordinary sense, and the structure which is most obvious, and explains: "The genuine religious wisdom which is equivalent to 'the fear of Jehovah' (more precisely, of which the fear of the Lord is the beginning), is the highest reward of humility; it is to him who attains it all (riches, honor, life), all that man desires and strives for beside, his greatest riches, his highest honor, his true life." In this view clause *b* is an analysis of the predicate of *a*.—A.]

Ver. 5. **Thorns, snares are in the way of the false.**—Here again we have an *asyndeton*, consisting in the associating of the two ideas which are in their import essentially equivalent, of "thorns" (comp. Job v. 5) and "snares, nets"

Digitized by Google

(chap. vii. 23; Ps. lxix. 22; Job xviii. 9, *etc.*). HITZIG proposes instead of the latter expression to read ספחים: "Thorns are poured out, are spread on the way of the false (?)." [Those who agree with Z. in the general structure of clause *b*, in his selection of the subject and predicate, very generally, at least our English expositors, make the verb affirmative rather than hortative. RUEETSCHI (as above, p. 155), on the ground of the very general idiom of the book of Proverbs, and in regard to this phrase in particular, שֹׁמֵר נַפְשׁוֹ, considers the clause as inverted: "he who keepeth far from the thorns and snares that strew the way of the false, destroying him, notwithstanding all his cunning, saveth his life."—A.]—With *b* compare xvi. 17.

3. Vers. 6–12. Of good discipline, frugality, uprightness, love and fidelity as further important means to the preservation of a good name.—**Train up a child** (early) **in the way he should go**.—The verb which, according to Arabic analogies, is equivalent to *imbuit, initiavit* (comp. SCHULTENS on this passage), denotes here the first instruction that is given to a boy, his early education and the formation of his habits. Compare the expression of HORACE (Ep. I., 2, 69): *Quo semel est imbuta recens, servabit odorem Testa diu;* and also the modern proverbs *Jung gewohnt, alt gethan* [Young accustomed is done old]: or "*Was Hänschen nicht lernt, lernt Hans nimmermehr*" ["What little Johnnie does not learn, John learns never." So our English proverb—"Just as the twig is bent the tree's inclined."] עַל־פִּי דַרְכּוֹ can have no other meaning than "according to the standard of his way" (Gen. xliii. 7; Lev. xxvii. 8, *etc.*), *i. e.*, according to the way that is determined for him, according to the calling and the manner of life for which he is intended. With this interpretation, which is as simple as it is pertinent, HITZIG's emendation may be dismissed as superfluous: עַל־פִּי רַכּוֹ, "according to his tenderness, since he is still tender." [Notwithstanding the "simplicity" of the interpretation "in accordance with his way, or his going," three different meanings have been found in it. It may be, *a*) "his way" in the sense of his own natural and characteristic style and manner,—and then his training will have reference to that to which he is naturally fitted; or *b*), the way in life which he is intended by parents or guardians to pursue; or *c*) the way in which he ought to go. The last is moral and relates to the general Divine intention concerning man's earthly course; the second is human and economical; the first is individual and to some extent even physical. Yet although the third presents the highest standard and has been generally adopted and used where little account is made of the original, it has the least support from the Hebrew idiom. So DE W., B., K., S., H. (?), and others.—A.]

Ver. 7. **The rich ruleth over poor men.**—Observe here again the significant interchange between singular and plural like that above in ver. 3, corresponding with the actual conditions of human society. The same relation of dependence comes in play however in like manner between borrowers and lenders; indebtedness always destroys freedom, even though no sale into slavery of him who was unable to pay should ever take place.

Ver. 8. **He that soweth iniquity shall reap calamity.**—Comp. Job iv. 8, and the converse sentiment, Prov. xi. 18.—**And the staff of his haughtiness vanisheth away**;—*i. e.*, the staff with which in the ebullitions of his anger (Isa. xiv. 6) he smote others comes to nought, as though dried up and rotten. Compare for the verb "to come to nought, to come to an end," Gen. xxi. 15; 1 Kings xvii. 16; Isa. x. 25. According to the last mentioned passage, UMBREIT, EWALD [DE W.] and ELSTER explain: "and the staff of his punishment is already prepared." But the verb כלה in that instance acquires the meaning "to be ready, to be already prepared," solely through the context,—and the noun (עֶבְרָה) means not "punishment," but always simply anger, passionate excitement. And to employ "staff of his anger" to describe "the rod of the Divine anger aroused against him" would surely be an unusually condensed and harsh expression.—HITZIG reads וְשֹׁבֵט עֲבֹדָתוֹ "and he that renounces (?) his service perishes," a meaning clearly quite insipid and little appropriate as the result of a very artificial and violent emendation, for which the text of the LXX neither in ver. 8 *b*, nor in the spurious verse which this version exhibits appended to our verse, offers any adequate support whatsoever.—[FUERST distinguished two radical meanings in the verb און, from one of which the derived noun has the meaning "nothingness, vanity," here adopted by E. V., and B.; the other gives the meaning "calamity," and in this sense the word is here understood more forcibly and appropriately, by DE W., K., H., N., M., S.—RUEETSCHI vigorously supports our author's interpretation of clause *b*.—A.]

Ver. 9. **He that hath a bountiful eye shall be blessed.**—He who is "good in the eye" is the exact opposite of the man "evil in the eye" (chap. xxiii. 6); it is he therefore who looks around not wickedly but in kindness and friendliness. Such a one will besides always be charitable in disposition and action, and therefore as he dispenses blessing he will also receive blessing. The conjunction (כִּי) as the beginning of the second clause should doubtless be regarded rather as a causal, than, with HITZIG, as a conditional particle; it is therefore not "*if* he gives" (that he does this is in fact already implied in his being described as having "a bountiful eye"), but "since," or "for he gives," *etc.*

Ver. 10. **Chase away the scorner and contention goeth out.**—That scoffing is a chief source of contention and strife was already expressed in chap. xxi. 24. Contention "goeth out," *viz.*, with the scoffer, when he leaves the assembly in which he has given forth his scoffing utterances (the LXX rightly supply ἐκ συνεδρίου).—**And strife and reproach cease**,—for the evil example of the scoffer had excited the whole assembly to mutual abuse and recrimination (קָלוֹן has here this active meaning).

Digitized by Google

Ver 11. **He that loveth with a pure heart, whose lips are gracious, the king is his friend.**—Thus, without doubt correctly, UMBREIT, ELSTER, HITZIG; for the passages xiii. 4, 24; xiv. 18 present no sufficient analogy for EWALD's interpretation of the last clause, "he is the king's friend;" and BERTHEAU's conception of the phrase "grace of lips" as a second accusative object of the verb "loveth" ("he that loveth purity of heart, and grace on his lips, the king is his friend") has against it the decided inappropriateness of the expression "to love the grace of his lips" as conveying the idea of "cultivating a wise eloquence." Furthermore we have to compare chiefly xvi. 13; for it is really wise and good counsellors who are there as here designated the favorites of the king.—[Few verses in the Book of Proverbs whose reading is unquestioned have received more interpretations. In clause *a* "purity of heart" is made the object by almost every interpreter, instead of an adverbial adjunct as Z. makes it. The "grace of lips" in clause *b*, in addition to BERTHEAU's construction (see above), is made a part of the subject—"*to whom*, or *whose* is grace of lips," *e. g.*, by DE W., EWALD, K.; it is made the first part of the predicate "*to him*, or *his* is grace of lips," *e. g.*, by the E. V. in the margin, by H., N., S., M., W.; while the text of the E. V. makes it adverbial. —A.]

Ver. 12. **The eyes of Jehovah preserve knowledge,**—*i. e.*, secure protection to him who possesses and evinces true discernment and knowledge (an example, therefore, of the *abstr. pro concreto*). With clause *b*, furthermore, the meaning seems to correspond better which HITZIG obtains, when he, perhaps in this instance emending wisely, writes רָעַת instead of דַּעַת: Jehovah's eyes observe wickedness.—For the verb in clause *b* comp. xiii. 6; xxi. 12. The "words" of the false here denote his proposals or plans, the faithlessness which he devises by himself and discusses with others. [HOLDEN thinks it necessary to render the "affairs of the transgressor." The necessity is obviated by the above explanation.]

4. Vers. 13-16. Of slothfulness, wantonness, folly and avarice, as further chief hinderances to the attainment of a good name.—**The slothful saith: (There is) a lion without,** *etc.;*—*i. e.*, he has recourse to the most senseless and ludicrous excuses, if in any way he may not be obliged to go out to labor; he therefore says, *e. g.*, a lion has stolen into the city, and may possibly destroy him in the midst of the tumult and crowd of the streets. Comp. xv. 19. [See critical notes for an explanation of the tense of the main verb.]

Ver. 14. **A deep pit is the mouth of the strange woman,**—*i. e.*, her seductive language; comp. ii. 16; v. 3; vi. 24; vii. 5 sq.; and also xxiii. 27, where the harlot herself is described as a deep ditch.—**He that is accursed of Jehovah.**—The "cursed of Jehovah" the exact opposite of the man "blessed (בָּרוּךְ) of Jehovah," therefore one visited by the curse of an angered God.

Ver. 15. **Foolishness is bound in the heart of the child,**—*i. e.*, it belongs to the disposition of all children, who are altogether and without exception νήπιοι,—infallibly so (comp. 1 Kings iii. 7), and must therefore necessarily be removed from them by the diligent employment of the "rod of correction" (comp. xiii. 24; xix. 18; xxiii. 13, 14). Comp. our proverb "*Jugend hat kein Tugend*" [Youth hath no virtue].—[KAMPH., from the absence of an adversative particle before clause *b*, judges it better to take the first clause as conditional: "If foolishness be bound," *etc.* Here is then the remedy for the supposed exigency. But this is surely needless, and vastly weakens the import of clause *a*, with its impressive declaration of an urgent and universal need.—A.]

Ver. 16. **One oppresseth the poor only to make him rich;**—*i. e.*, the oppression which one, perchance some rich landlord or tyrannical ruler, practises on a poor man, rouses his moral energy, and thus by means of his tireless industry and his productive labor in his vocation, brings it to pass, that he works himself out of needy circumstances into actual prosperity. On the other hand, according to clause *b*, all presents which one makes to an indolent rich man, prodigal, and therefore abandoned by the blessing of God, contribute nothing to stay the waste of his possessions that has once commenced. What one gives to him is drawn into the vortex of his prodigality and profligacy, and therefore is subservient, in spite of the contrary intention of the giver, only "to want," or to the diminution of his possessions (comp. xi. 24).—Thus most of the recent expositors correctly explain, especially EWALD, UMBREIT, ELSTER, HITZIG [DE W., K.], while BERTHEAU's conception of the passage: "He that oppresseth the poor to take for himself, giveth to a rich man (*viz.*, himself) only to want," approximates to the old incorrect rendering of the Vulgate, LUTHER, *etc.* See in reply HITZIG on this passage. [H., N., M., S. follow the E. V. in giving this reflexive meaning to the pronoun of clause *a*, while WORDSW. guardedly expresses a preference for the other view; God's providence overrules the rich man's rapacity, and turns obsequious liberality toward the rich against him whom it would benefit. For according to this view it is not the giver, as the E. V. suggests, but the receiver, that shall come to want. RUEETSCHI comes vigorously to the defence of the older explanation. The subject is then single: the rich man seeks to advance himself by oppression of the poor; he gives wrongfully to one that has, and God thwarts him. We prefer this elder exposition.—A.]

DOCTRINAL, ETHICAL, HOMILETIC AND PRACTICAL.

The doctrine of the great worth of a good name forms undoubtedly the main theme of the section before us; for all that follows the introductory proposition of ver. 1, which is expressly shaped with reference to this theme, may be easily and without any violence regarded as a statement of the most important means or conditions to the attainment and maintenance of a good name. These conditions are given in part negatively, as not consisting in riches (ver. 2, comp. ver. 16), nor in falseness of heart (ver. 5), nor in scoffing

Digitized by Google

and love of abuse (ver. 10), nor in unrighteous dealing (ver. 8, comp. ver. 12), nor in sloth and licentiousness (vers. 13, 14). They are also given in part positively, as consisting in a genuine prudence (ver. 3), in humility and the fear of God (ver. 4), in a wise frugality and industry (vers. 7 and 16), in charity toward the poor (ver. 9), in purity of heart together with that grace of speech which rests upon it (ver. 11),—in a word, in all the excellent qualities as well as the inward and outward advantages to which a strict and wise training of children is able to aid the man who is naturally foolish and ignorant (vers. 6 and 15).

Homily on the entire section: On the great worth of a good name, and on the means to its attainment and preservation. Comp. STÖCKER: Of a good name: 1) How it is to be gained (vers. 1-4); 2) what chief hinderances threaten the possession of it (vers. 5-16).—In similar style, WOHLFARTH, *Calwer Handb., etc.*

Ver. 1. MELANCHTHON: With reason dost thou say: I need a good conscience for God's sake, but a good name for my neighbor's sake. A good name is really a good thing well-pleasing to God, and must be esteemed and sought by us, because God would have the difference between good and evil brought to the day by the testimony of public opinion, so that accordingly those who do right may be promoted and preserved, the unjust, on the contrary, censured, punished and destroyed. From such public witness we are to become aware of the existence of a moral law, and should reflect, that a holy God and supreme avenger of all evil lives. We must therefore strive after a good name for two reasons: 1) because God would have us regard the judgments of upright men (Ecclesiast. vi. 1 sq.); 2) because He would also have us serve as a good example to others (1 Cor. x. 31 sq.; Phil. iv. 8).—STARKE: If a good name is better than riches, then it is our duty, in case of need, to defend our innocence (Am. vii. 11; John viii. 49), but no less to rescue the good name of others also (1 Sam. xx. 31 sq.).—[ARNOT: The atmosphere of a good name surrounding it imparts to real worth additional body and breadth.—MUFFET: a good name maketh a man's speeches and actions the more acceptable; it spreadeth his virtues unto his glory, and the stirring up of others; it remaineth after death; it doth good to the children of him who is well spoken of; and finally is a means of advancement.]

Vers. 2-5. MELANCHTHON (on ver. 2): Know that there is a Divine providence, and that not by chance but by God's ordinance some are rich, others poor. Therefore it is of moment that both walk before God according to their state and calling, that the poor therefore do not murmur against God, but humble himself under His hand, and take comfort in the promises of His word (Matth. v. 3),—that the rich, however, be not presumptuous, and do not set his trust on uncertain riches (1 Tim. vi. 17), *etc.—Tübingen Bible* (on the same verse):—If the rich were always humble and the poor patient, and both alike penitent, pious, loving and peaceable, then rich and poor might live happy and content together.—[R. HALL:—The rich and the poor meet together 1) in the participation of a common nature; 2) in the process of the same social economy; 3) in the house of God; 4) in the circumstances of their entrance into this world and in the circumstances of their exit out of it: 5) in the great crises of the future.—SAURIN:—That diversity of condition which God hath been pleased to establish among men is perfectly consistent with equality; the splendid condition of the rich includes nothing that favors their ideas of self-preference; there is nothing in the low condition of the poor which deprives them of their real dignity or debases their intelligence formed in the image of God, *etc.*—See BISHOP BUTLER's Sermon before the Lord Mayor.—R. HOOKER (on ver. 3):—It is nature which teacheth a wise man in fear to hide himself, but grace and faith teach him where.—MUFFET:—Although God can save us only by His power, yet He will not without our own care and endeavor, nor without those means which He hath ordained to that intent and purpose].—HASIUS (on ver. 3): —The best hiding from danger and calamity is under the wings of the Almighty (Ps. xci. 1 sq.). —J. LANGE (on ver. 4):—He who would be exalted to glory, must first suffer himself to be well humbled.—(On ver. 5):—The ungodly finds in the path to hell nothing but thorns and snares, and yet he presses on in it! A sign of the greatness and fearfulness of the ruin of man's sin.

Vers. 6-13. [SOUTH (on ver. 6):—A sermon on the education of youth].—STARKE (on ver. 6):—The spirits of children are like plastic wax; according as good or evil is impressed upon them will their chief inclination be a good or evil one. —On ver. 8):—Upon unrighteousness and ungodliness there surely follows a terrible end. But who believes it? (Ps. lxxiii. 18, 19).—CRAMER (on ver. 10):—One sin ever develops itself from another. From mockery comes wrath, from wrath comes strife, from strife one comes to blows, and from blows comes reproach.—(On ver. 11): —A true heart and a pleasing speech are rarely found together, especially at the courts of this world's great ones, where there is only quite too much hypocrisy and unfaithfulness to be found, hiding behind smooth words.

Vers. 13-16. J. LANGE (on ver. 13):—He that loveth his own soul and therefore on account of comfort and tenderness will not go forth to carry on the Lord's work, will lose and eternally destroy his soul, John xii. 25.—(On ver. 15):—God's children must in their life have to experience sharp strokes of affliction in many forms, for, still as heretofore spiritually children, folly in many forms remains in their hearts, and the sin that yet dwells in them makes itself perceptible by frequent outbreaks.—GEIER (on ver. 15): —With mere loving words and flattering speech can no child be happily trained; strict and wise correction must be added.—(On ver. 16):—Beware of all unrighteous means of becoming rich through others' injury. Better to have little with a good conscience than great treasure with injustice!—*Calwer Handb.* (on ver. 16):—He that enriches himself on the poor, one richer than he will in turn impoverish him.—[EDWARDS (on ver. 15):—The rod of correction is proper to drive away no other foolishness than that which is of a moral nature. But how comes wickedness to be so firmly bound, and strongly fixed, in the hearts of children, if it be not there naturally?]

Digitized by Google

III. ADDITIONS MADE BEFORE HEZEKIAH'S TIME TO THE OLD NUCLEUS OF THE COLLECTION MADE BY SOLOMON.

CHAP. XXII. 17—XXIV. 34.

First Supplement:—Various precepts concerning righteousness and practical wisdom.

Chap. XXII. 17.—XXIV. 22.

a) Introductory admonition to take to heart the words of the wise man.

CHAP. XXII. 17-21.

17 Incline thine ear and hear words of the wise,
and apply thine heart to my knowledge!
18 For it is pleasant if thou keep them within thee;
let them abide together upon thy lips!
19 That thy trust may be in Jehovah,
I have taught thee this day, even thee!
20 Have not I written to thee excellent words,
with counsels and knowledge,
21 to make known to thee the certainty of the words of truth,
that thou mightest return words of truth to them that send thee?

b) Admonition to justice toward others, especially the poor.

CHAP. XXII. 22-29.

22 Rob not the poor because he is poor,
and oppress not the wretched in the gate;
23 for Jehovah will conduct their cause,
and spoil the soul of those that spoil them.
24 Have no intercourse with an angry man,
and with a furious man thou shalt not go,
25 lest thou learn his ways
and prepare a snare for thy soul.
26 Be not among them that strike hands,
who become sureties for debts;
27 if thou hast nothing to pay
why shall he take thy bed from under thee?
28 Remove not the ancient landmark
which thy fathers have set.
29 Seest thou a man that is diligent in his business—
before kings shall he stand;
he shall not stand before mean men.

GRAMMATICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 17. [Observe the interchange of the imperative הַט with the 2d pers. sing. of the Imperf. תָּשִׁית.—A.]

Ver. 18. [In יִכֹּנוּ we have illustrated, as in many other instances, the final disregard of the originally strict application of the suffixes to their own person and number: let *them* abide in *its* entireness, *etc.*—A.]

Ver. 20. [Bött. § 707, 2, explains the masc. adj. שָׁלִשִׁים of the K'ri as an example of masculines used in describing the pre-eminent and striking,—but on account of the הַיּוֹם of ver. 19 gives the preference to the K'thibh שִׁלְשׁוֹם. So Stuart and Muensch.—A.]

Ver. 21. [לְשֹׁלְחֶיךָ, one of the plural participles, not uncommon in our book, to be taken distributively, as applicable to each of all possible cases. Bött. ¿ 702, e.—A.]

Vers. 22, 24, 26, 28. [Further examples of the Jussive with the negative adverb אַל, instead of a direct prohibition with the Imperative; comp. Latin, *ne facias*; Greek, *μὴ γράφῃς* (Kuehner, ¿ 250, 5, Hadley. ¿ 723, *a*); as though in prohibitions a sense of fitness or obligation were appealed to rather than an authority asserted.—A.]—(Ver. 24). בּוֹא אֵת here, in accordance with the later *usus loquendi*, is equivalent to הָלַךְ אֵת; comp. Ps. xxvi. 4.

Ver. 25. [The more compact form תֶּאֱלַף for תֶּאֱלַף under the influence of the preceding פֶּן; Bött. ¿ 1059, *d*.—A.]

Ver. 27. [An example of what is called the *concrete* impersonal in Hebrew is found in יִקַּח; why should *he*, any one do this? Bött. ¿ 935, *c*.—A.]

Ver. 29. [יִתְיַצֵּב; Böttcher's *Fiens licitum* or *debitum*, rendered by the German *darf*: it is his privilege or prerogative.—A.]

EXEGETICAL.

1. That a new division of the collection begins with ver. 17, coming from another hand than compiled the preceding main division, appears not merely from the expression "words of wise men," which reminds us of i. 6, but also from the characteristic style of the proverbs which are found from this point onward to the end of chap. xxiv. These no longer consist of verses of two clauses constructed according to the antithetic parallelism, but for the most part of longer sentences, which as a general rule comprise two verses, sometimes, however, three (*e. g.* xxiii. 1–3, 6–8), or even five (thus xxii. 31–35; xxiv. 30–34). By the side of the isolated proverbs containing an antithesis of two members, such as are here and there interspersed (*e. g.* xxii. 28; xxiii. 9, 12, 19, 22; xxiv. 8 sq., 23 sq.), there are found in addition several verses constructed of three clauses (xxii. 29; xxiii. 5, 7, 31, 35; xxiv. 12, 31). There is prevalent everywhere the minutely hortatory or in turn admonitory style, rather than that which is descriptive and announces facts. The אַל which serves to introduce the utterance of warnings is found not less than *seventeen* times within the two and a half chapters before us, while in the twelve chapters of the preceding main division it occurred but *twice* (chap. xx. 13 and 22). Many linguistic peculiarities in the section appear, moreover, to indicate a later period; whether it be the earliest period after the exile, as Hitzig proposes, may indeed be the more doubtful and uncertain, since many peculiarities of the section, especially the expression, "words of the wise" (in xxii. 17), like the prevailing admonitory tone of the discourse, seem to favor the assumption of Delitzsch, that its author is identical with that of the introductory main division, chap. i.–ix. Comp. Introduction, ¿ 12, p. 29.

2. Vers. 17-21. The introductory admonition to give heed to the words of the wise.

Ver. 18. **For it is pleasant if thou keep them within thee.** "Them," *viz.*, "the words of the wise," for only to these can the suffix relate, and not to "my knowledge;" so that accordingly this proposition in ver. 18 *a*, beginning with "for," serves to justify only the first half and not the whole of ver. 17. With 18 *b*: **let them abide together upon thy lips**, the admonitory discourse proceeds, and in the first instance attaches itself to the substance of 17 *b* (comp. v. 2). Against the common construction, which regards the verb יִכֹּנוּ as a continuation of the conditional clause, "if thou keep," *etc.*, [so *e. g.* De W., N., S., M., Muffet, *etc.*], we adduce the absence of a second conditional particle, or at least a copula before the Imperf., which in its present position at the beginning of a clause clearly appears to be a Jussive. Comp. Hitzig on this passage.

Ver. 19. **That thy trust may be in Jehovah I have taught thee this day, even thee!** The perfect represents the work of teaching as already begun and now in progress, like the "I have given," chap. iv. 2.—אַף אָתָּה, *etiam te, inquam*, Germ. *ja dich!* yea, thee! even thee! The expression brings out strongly the idea that the present teaching is designed for the student of wisdom who is here addressed, for him and for no one else (Mercer, Geier, J. H. Michaelis, Ewald, De W., Bertheau, *etc.*). There is no occasion for Umbreit's interrogative conception of the words: "but thou?": *i. e.* dost thou also attend to my teaching? and the same is true of Hitzig's attempted emendation, according to which we should read אַף אֹתָהּ, "this also, the very same."—The first member, moreover, gives not so much the substance as the object of the teaching, and that as consisting in the development of a firm trust in God, or in the increase and establishment of faith (comp. Luke xvii. 5).

Ver. 20. **Have I not written** (Z., "behold, I write) **to thee excellent words?** (The K'ri שָׁלִישִׁים from שָׁלִישׁ), which is equivalent to נָגִיד, "a great man, a nobleman" (comp. Keil on 2 Sam. xxiii. 8), describes the words as of the highest, noblest worth, of pre-eminent value, as *verba eximia s. principalia* (comp. the similar term in viii. 6). So, and doubtless correctly, Ziegler, Ewald, Elster, *etc.* Comp. the early rendering, *τρισμέγιστα*, of the *Vers. Veneta*. [K. renders "expressive, or significant," *bedeutsam*]. Others interpret the K'ri differently, *e. g.* Hitzig: bequests, *Vermächtnisse* (in accordance with the Rabbinic שָׁלִישׁ, *depositarius*); the Vulg. and some of the older expositors, "three-fold, *i. e.* several times, in various ways" (so Luther): or even "in three forms," so that the reference will be to the Law, the Prophets, and the Hagiographa, as the three chief constituents of the divine word, or again, to the three books of Solomon, *etc.* The K'thibh is explained ordinarily, by supplying an omitted תְּמוֹל, in the sense of "before, formerly;" thus Umbreit, *e. g.*; "have I not formerly written to thee?" (In a similar way Bertheau). But the ellipsis of a "yester-

Digitized by Google

day" before this שָׁלִשׁוֹם would be without any linguistic analogy; and in a section which introduces subsequent admonitions a reminder of teachings formerly given seems little appropriate. For this reason the K'ri in the sense above given is unquestionably to be preferred. [S. and M. prefer the adverbial rendering; the majority of the English commentators with the E. V. the substantive.—A.]—**With counsels and knowledge**, so far forth, *viz.*, as these are contained in the "princely words."

Ver. 21. **To make known to thee the certainty of the words of truth.** "Correctness, verity," as *e. g.* in the Targ. on Jer. xxii. 18, 15; Sam. Gen. xv. 6 (where it is made equivalent to צְדָקָה, "righteousness"). Comp. the Chaldee קוּשְׁטָא in the Targ. on our passage.—**That thou mightest be able to return words of truth to them that send thee.** "Words, truth," a sort of apposition, describing the discourse to be conveyed as consisting of words which are "as it were themselves the truth" (UMBREIT, ELSTER). The expression is like the "words consolations, *i. e.* consoling words," in Zech. i. 13.—The "senders" (comp. x. 26) are here naturally the parents, who have sent their son to the teacher of wisdom, that he may bring back thence to them real culture of spirit and heart; or again, that "he may know how to bring home to them in all things true and not false or erroneous report" (HITZIG).—[HOLDEN unnecessarily makes the suffix of the participle represent an indirect object; "them that send unto thee." For the construction "words truth" see GREEN, § 253, 2.—A.]

3. Vers. 22-29. Admonition to justice toward others, especially the poor and distressed.—**Rob not the poor because he is poor.** דַּל is the depressed, the straitened, he who is deprived of help for judicial contests and other cases of want, and who therefore needs the protection of the more powerful and the more prosperous.—**And oppress not the poor in the gate**, *i. e.* in the place where courts are held; comp. Job v. 4; xxxi. 21; Ps. cxxvii. 5.—[Comp. THOMSON'S *Land and Book*, I. 31; and other works illustrative of Oriental usages, *passim*.—A.]

Ver. 23. **For Jehovah will conduct their cause.** The emphatic announcement of the reason for the warning in the preceding ver.; comp. xxiii. 11. With respect to the just punishment threatened in clause *b*, comp. Matt. xviii. 32 sq.—[God is not merely a formidable because an all-just and almighty advocate, appearing before the unjust tribunal, in behalf of the wronged; He is not merely a judge sitting in a higher court of appeal; He is the executor of the universal laws of justice to which the judges as well as the arraigned of earth are alike amenable. When Jehovah "cheats or spoils" it is in vindication and not in violation of eternal justice and right. FUERST makes the "life" an adverbial modification, and not the object, so that it expresses the extent of his work, "even to the life."—A.]

Vers. 24, 25. Warning against intercourse with men of violent temper, like xxvi. 21; xxix. 22; comp. James i. 20.—**And with a furious man thou shalt not go**, lit., "go not along with him."—**And prepare a snare for thy soul**; *viz.*, the passion that would become a snare, a fatal net for thee (comp. xx. 25).—With the warning against suretyship in vers. 26, 27, comp. vi. 1-4; xi. 15; xvii. 18; xx. 16.

Ver. 28. Warning against the violent removal of boundaries; comp. the prohibitions of the Law; Deut. xix. 14; xxvii. 17; and also Job xxiv. 2; Hos. v. 10; and below, Prov. xxiii. 10, 11.

Ver. 29. **Seest thou a man diligent in business.** The verb, a Perf. Kal, is conditional; "if thou seest;" comp. vi. 22. מָהִיר, apt, active, expert (LUTHER, *endelich*).—**Before kings shall he stand** (Z. "may he set himself"), *viz.* to serve them, to receive their commands, comp. 1 Sam. xvi. 21, 22.—**He shall not stand before mean men.** Lit., "men in the dark," *homines obscuri, ignobiles* (Vulg.). The antithesis to the "kings" is naturally an idea of a somewhat general and comprehensive kind, describing those who belong to the low multitude, the plebeians. To generalize the idea of "king" in like manner, as if it here expressed something like "noble, rich," is therefore unnecessary (in opposition to HITZIG on this passage). [LORD BACON says: Of all the qualities which kings especially look to and require in the choice of their servants, that of despatch and energy in the transactions of business is the most acceptable, *etc., etc.* There is no other virtue which does not present some shadow of offence to the minds of kings. Expedition in the execution of their commands is the only one which contains nothing that is not acceptable (*De Augmentis Scientiarum*, Lib. VIII.)].

DOCTRINAL, ETHICAL, HOMILETIC AND PRACTICAL.

There are only two main ideas with the presentation of which this section is concerned; these, however, are thoughts of no slight weight and significance. That true wisdom, which is indeed one with firm confidence in God, is to be secured and maintained above all things else, the introductory admonition (vers. 17-21) brings out with earnest emphasis. And that such wisdom as this should manifest itself in a demeanor toward one's fellow-men just and kind in all directions,—to impress this is the single aim and end of the hortatory and admonitory addresses that follow in vers. 22-29.—For not merely the warnings against the unrighteous plundering of one's neighbors (vers. 22, 23), against passion and a ruinous familiarity with the passionate, and against a wicked removal of boundaries, have this end in view,—but also the cautions against suretyship, which are apparently brought forward merely as prudential suggestions (vers. 26, 27), and against the wasting of executive talents and skill in the service of insignificant masters (ver. 29), fall under the same generalization, so far forth as both kinds of unwise conduct point to an intentional hiding of the talent received from the Lord, and to an inclination to the low and the common, which is as wilful as it is unprofitable and contemptible. He who through

Digitized by Google

inconsiderate suretyship for unworthy men deprives himself of the means of a free and vigorous efficiency in life, puts his light under a bushel quite as really, and with no less guilt than he who fritters away his strength in a narrow and obscure sphere of labor, rather than by earnest striving for an influential station seeks to make the results of his activity the common property of many. Comp. Matth. v. 14-16; xxv. 24; John iii. 20, 21; vii. 4.

These two main truths,—the praise of wisdom as the source of all real confidence in God, and the subsequent admonition to righteousness in many particulars, meet in the idea of *Faith*, or obedient consecration to the invisible holy God, as the sum of all true wisdom (ver. 19). Put in form as the *leading thought* in a *homiletic discussion*, this fundamental idea would be expressed in some such way as this: On faith in God as the ground of all righteousness and the end of all wisdom;—or, Faith (confidence in God) as the basis and end of all wisdom.—STÖCKER (regarding the whole as a direct continuation of vers. 1-16): Admonition to seek after a good name.—STARKE: Admonition to obedience to the true wisdom (17-21), to right treatment of the poor (22, 23), to the avoidance of intercourse with bad men (24-27), and to a scrupulous regard for boundaries (28, 29).

Ver. 17-21. ZELTNER: All the world's pleasure is to be accounted nothing in comparison with the true, sweet pleasure which comes from the word of God. This they know who have tasted the sweetness of this word (Heb. vi. 5).—J. LANGE: Where the good will to obey is wanting, there all teaching and preaching are vain. This is the reason why so many hundred sermons are heard by the majority without profit.—He who is heartily and willingly obedient to Christ finds in this no burden; in Christ's obedience consists rather the highest joy.—R. FLOREY (on vers. 17-19; see *Hirtenstimmen an die Gemeinde im Hause des Herrn*, II., Leips., 1849): In the training of your children let your hope be directed to the Lord; for 1) the word of the Lord gives the right direction; 2) His service gives the right strength; 3) His grace gives the right power besides.—TH. HERGANG (*Reformationspredigt*) on vers. 17-19; (see *Sonntagsfeier*, 1861, p. 357): What a blessed duty is it to hold in honor the memory of such men as have deserved well in the true culture of their own and succeeding times! [A. FULLER (vers. 17, 18): If we study the Scriptures as *Christians*, the more familiar we are with them, the more we shall feel their importance; but if otherwise, our familiarity with the word will be like that of soldiers and doctors with death—it will wear away all sense of its importance from our minds.—TRAPP (ver. 19): Only a Divine word can beget a Divine faith.]

Vers. 22-29. STARKE (on vers. 22, 23): If the Lord efficiently sympathizes with those who are in outward poverty, still more does He do this for the spiritually poor, who are of broken heart and tremble at His word (Is. lxvi. 2).—[ARNOT (on vers. 22, 23): There is a causal connection and not merely a coincidence between the spread of God's word and the security of men's rights in a land. As worship rises to heaven, justice radiates on earth. If faith go foremost, charity will follow.—LAWSON (ver. 22): For magistrates to be guilty of the crime of oppression, is a perversion of an institution of God into an engine of abominable wickedness.—(On ver. 23): The unjust spoiler has the mercy of God against him as well as His justice.—TRAPP (on ver. 23): A poor man's livelihood is his life. God, therefore, who loves to pay oppressors home in their own coin, will have life for life.—LORD BACON (on ver. 24): It is of the first importance for the peace and security of life to have no dealings with passionate men, or such as easily engage in disputes and quarrels; for they will perpetually involve us in strife and faction, so that we shall be compelled either to break off our friendship, or disregard our own safety.—BRIDGES (on vers. 26, 27): In "devising liberal things" we must combine scrupulous regard to justice and truth. Else our charity will prove the scandal, instead of the glory, of our profession.]—MELANCHTHON (on ver. 28): The injunction (that boundaries are not to be removed) may by a simple allegory be expanded to this prohibition; that laws in general that are venerable from their age are not to be altered, except in case of the most pressing and obvious need.—VON GERLACH (On ver. 29): Peculiar facility and ability God will bring into an appropriate sphere of action.—[TRAPP: A diligent man shall not long sit in a low place. Or if he do all the days of his life, yet if his diligence proceed out of conscience, "he shall stand before the King" of kings when he dies.]

---

c) Warning against greediness, intemperance, impurity, *etc.*

CHAP. XXIII.

1 When thou sittest to eat with a ruler,
consider well him who is before thee,—
2 and thou wilt put a knife to thy throat
if thou art a gluttonous man.
3 Crave not his dainties,
for it is deceitful food.

Digitized by Google

4 Labor not to be rich;
cease from (this) thine own wisdom.
5 Wilt thou look eagerly after it—and it is no longer there?
for assuredly it maketh itself wings,
as an eagle that flieth toward the heavens.
6 Eat not the bread of him that hath an evil eye,
and crave not his dainties.
7 For as he thinketh in his heart, so is he;
"eat and drink" saith he to thee,
but his heart is not with thee.
8 Thy morsel which thou hast eaten, wilt thou cast up,
and wilt have lost thy pleasant words.
9 Speak not in the ears of a fool,
for he would despise the wisdom of thy words.
10 Remove not old landmarks,
and into the field of the fatherless enter thou not.
11 For their avenger is a mighty one;
He will maintain their cause with thee.
12 Apply thine heart to instruction,
and thine ears to words of knowledge.
13 Withhold not correction from the child;
for if thou beatest him with the rod he shall not die.
14 Thou beatest him with the rod,
and his soul thou deliverest from hell.
15 My son, if thine heart be made wise,
my heart will rejoice, even mine;
16 And my reins will exalt,
when thy lips speak right things.
17 Let not thine heart press on eagerly after sinners,
but after the fear of Jehovah all the day;
18 for if the end come
then thy hope shall not be destroyed.
19 Hear thou, my son, and be wise,
and incline thine heart in a right way.
20 Be not among winebibbers,
who devour much flesh.
21 For the drunkard and the glutton shall come to want,
and the sleep of sloth clotheth in rags.
22 Hearken to thy father that hath begotten thee,
and despise not thy mother when she is old.
23 Buy the truth and sell it not,
wisdom, and discipline and understanding.
24 The father of a righteous man rejoiceth greatly;
he that begetteth a wise man hath joy in him.
25 Let thy father and thy mother be glad,
and her that bare thee exult.
26 My son, give me thine heart,
and let thine eyes delight in my ways.
27 For a harlot is a deep ditch,
and the strange woman a narrow pit.
28 Yea, she lieth in wait like a robber,
and the false among men doth she multiply.
29 Who hath woe? who hath grief?
who hath contentions,—who trouble,—who wounds without cause,
who hath redness of eyes?
30 They that tarry long at the wine,
who come to seek mixed wine.

Digitized by Google

31 Look not on the wine, when it is red,
when it sparkleth in the cup,
when it glideth smoothly!
32 At last it biteth like a serpent,
and stingeth like an adder.
33 Thine eyes shall see strange things,
and thine heart shall utter perverse things;
34 and thou shalt be as one that (is) in the midst of the sea,
as one that lieth on the top of a mast.
35 "They have stricken me—I have not felt it—
they have smitten me—I have not known it—
when I awake I will seek it yet again."

GRAMMATICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1.—[We have in בִּין, as in גִּיל, ver. 24, examples of the "spurious" ע״י verbs, or mixed ע״י and ע״ו. The present result is that we have here in ver. 1, and in the K'ri in ver. 24, forms apparently of the Inf. constr., where the idiom of the language requires an Inf. abs. See GREEN, § 158, 2, 3; BÖTT., §§ 988, 4, *a*; 1141; 1143, 1, 2, *etc.* The תָּבִין is followed by a Perf. *consec.* to express the idea of the "*Fiens debitum*," what ought always to be, and so may confidently be expressed as a finished result. BÖTT., § 981, B. γ.—A.]

Ver. 4.—The punctuation לְהַעֲשִׁיר is unquestionably correct (see Exegetical notes); to alter it to לְהֶעָשִׁיר (LXX, Targ., HITZIG), as though the admonition were against laboring for the favor of *the rich man*, is unnecessary.

Ver. 5.—We render according to the K'ri יָעוּף, which is certainly to be preferred to the unmeaning K'thibh ועיף (for which many conjecture וְעוֹף, "as eagles and birds of the heavens"). [BÖTT., § 1132, 3, very confidently proposes וַיָּעֹף, making the verb a Jussive.—A.]

Ver. 7.—[For the form אֱכוֹל comp. critical notes on xxii. 7, 8.—A.]

The verb (שָׁעַר) pointed and accented as here can be nothing but 3d pers. Perf. Kal, equivalent to the Chald. שְׁעַר, *cogitavit, meditatus est;* and this meaning of the expression gives a general sense so appropriate that we ought clearly to abide by it (with ABEN EZRA, UMBREIT, BERTHEAU, ELSTER, *etc.* [so the E. V., N., S., M., W., DE W., FUERST], although no support can be found for it any where in the Old Testament. The LXX rendered שֵׂעָר "hair" [so he eats and drinks, as if any one should swallow a hair]; the Chald., שָׁעַר, "fool;" SCHULTENS, שַׂעַר, shuddering; EWALD and HITZIG, שֹׁעֵר divided ("as one who is divided in his soul") [HOLDEN and others, "as he is vile"]; but these are all unnecessary attempts at emendation.

Ver. 10.—[In שְׂדֵי BÖTT., § 821, Decl. II., and n. 5, maintains that we have a *sing. constr.* from the original form שָׂדַי, and not a *plur. const.* collateral to שָׂדוֹת, as most of the grammars and lexicons hold. He compares עֲדֵי and עֲלֵי.—A.]

Ver. 12.—[הָבִיאָה, a poetical form, a lengthened Imper. pres. Comp. דְּעָה in xxiv. 14.—A.]

Ver. 15.—[The supplementary אָנִי conforms to the case of the preceding suffix of the same person, which is of course a genitive. BÖTT., § 855, 3.—A.]

Ver. 19.—אַשֵּׁר is here a real Piel with a factitive meaning, unlike its use in iv. 14.

Ver. 22.—[The demonstrative זֶה used, as it is occasionally in poetry and prophecy, not instead of a relative, but as the emphatic antecedent of an omitted relative. BÖTT., §§ 896, θ; 897, E.—A.]

Ver. 25.—[Instead of reading the verbs as simple Imperf., to be rendered by the future, they may perhaps be made more expressive if made examples of the "consultative" use of the Jussive: "let thy father and thy mother," *etc.* The E. V. is "thy father and thy mother shall," *etc.*—A.]

Ver. 26.—Instead of the K'thibh, תִּרְצֶנָה (=תִּרְצֶינָה), "let them delight in my words" (comp. xvi. 7), the K'ri, with all the old versions, calls unnecessarily for תִּצֹּרְנָה, "let them preserve or keep," *etc.*

Ver. 32.—[יַפְרִשׁ BÖTT would explain as shortened from יַפְרֵשׁ and not from יַפְרִישׁ. See § 1013, ex.—A.]

Ver. 33.—[יִרְאוּ, a masc. form agreeing with a fem. subject, as the fem. תִּרְאֶינָה would have seemed perhaps to agree with זָרוֹת. See BÖTT., § 936, A. *a.*—A.]

EXEGETICAL.

1. Vers. 1-8. Warnings against courting the favor of the powerful, against greed, and against intercourse with the envious. The first of these warnings, vers. 1-3. stands very plainly in immediate connection with the last verse of the preceding chapter. The counsel that one's powers be employed in the service of kings is followed by a warning against the dangers of a too confidential intercourse with powerful and honorable men, especially against the danger of being watched by them on occasion of their banquets, and possibly recognized as immoderate, as intemperate, as an epicure, *etc.* Comp. the Arabic proverb: He that eats the Sultan's soup burns his lips, though it be not till afterward (MEID., II., 741); or this other: With kings one seats himself at the table for the sake of honor, and not of surfeiting (*Thaâl Synt.*, p. 31); see HORACE also, *Ars poet.*, 434 sq., and Ecclesiast. ix. 13, 14; xxxi. 12-14.—**Consider well him who is before thee**, *viz.*, that he is not one of thine equals, but one much mightier and loftier (so LUTHER, UMBREIT, HITZIG [KAMPH., N., M.]

Digitized by Google

etc Others: Consider well *what* is before thee, *i. e.*, the food that is set before thee (LXX, Vulg., EWALD, BERTHEAU [E. V., H., S., WORDSW.] *etc.* Both explanations are possible; the first seems more consistent with the connection.

Ver 2. **Thou wilt put a knife to thy throat** Lit., "and thou hast put"—for which reason HITZIG thinks it necessary to put this entire verse after verse 3, and to regard it as a continuation of the reference made in 3, *b*, to the danger of eating with great men. But no ancient MS. or version exhibits any other order of the verses than the usual one, and besides this gives unquestionably a good logical progress in the thought. It is grammatically unjustifiable to regard the verb as Imperative (LXX, Vulg., LUTHER [E V., *etc.*]: "And put a knife to thy throat") [But BÖTT. justifies a rendering substantially the same (see Critical note) by saying, "Although the legislator and teacher prescribes only for the future, yet the hearer and reader (and their point of view must be taken) cannot regard the thing prescribed as merely future — Something that is in general terms enjoined he must, as soon as he becomes cognizant of it, not merely do in the future, but in case of need immediately, *etc.* This *Fiens debitum* remains then indeterminate in time" As between the two resulting ideas: "Thou hast virtually destroyed thyself if thou art a self-indulgent man," —and "Thou must at all hazards subdue thine appetite" we prefer the latter, with K., N., W., M., H., against S.—A.] **If thou art a gluttonous man,** lit. a master or owner of desire, not precisely one ruled by appetite (UMBREIT), but a man cherishing and maintaining strong desires; comp "Master of dreams," Gen. xxxvii. 19.

Ver. 3. **Crave not his dainties** (comp 6, *b*. xxiv 1): **for it is deceitful food**, lit., "bread of lies" (comp. xx 17). *i. e.*, a deceptive meal, which in reality has another object than that which it seems to have.

Vers. 4, 5 **Labor not to be rich** Since what follows plainly emphasizes the fugitive and perishable nature of riches in itself. the sentiment as a whole doubtless aims to deter from striving after wealth, or from covetousness.— **Cease from** (this) **thine own wisdom,** *viz* from that which has reference to the acquisition and preservation of riches —**Wilt thou look eagerly** (lit "let thine eyes fly") **after it**.—*a* we render in accordance with the K'ri, which in spite of the fact that a Hiphil of this verb does not occur elsewhere. is to be preferred to the unintelligible K'thibh; and we do not need (with HITZIG) to substitute the rendering "if thou faintest, if thou art weary" (from עוף "to be feeble or powerless;" comp Jer iv 31; Judg. iv 21)—**And it is no longer there,** has disappeared, is suddenly gone! Comp. the same expression, Job vii 9. also Gen v 24.—**For assuredly it maketh itself wings,** precisely "it will make itself wings;" comp 2 Sam xv. 1; 1 Kings i. 5. also the Latin phrase *alas sibi facere* (SIL ITAL. 16, 351) and our proverbial expression "to make one find his legs," or again "*Füsse kriegen und davon fliegen*" [to get feet and fly away].—**As an eagle that flieth towards the heavens** (see Critical notes).

Vers. 6-8. **Eat not the bread of him that hath an evil eye,** the jealous, the man of an evil eye is the opposite of the man with the "good eye," to him who is of a "kindly look," (comp. xxii. 9, Deut. xv. 9; Matth vi. 23).

Ver. 7. **For as he thinketh in his heart so is he** See Critical notes

Ver. 8. **Thy morsel which thou hast eaten thou shalt cast up**, and this under the constraint of the "evil eye" exciting vexation and disgust, under the feeling of bitterness which the envy and ill will of thine entertainer will excite in thee, and from the perception of the fruitlessness of thy friendly words which were intended to gain the false heart of this man

2 Vers. 9-11. Warning against intercourse with fools, and against violence —With ver. 9 comp ix 8 —**And into the field of the fatherless press thou not**; lit "come not into them." *i e.*, in the way of removing boundaries or other acts of violence. [HACKETT (*Scripture Illustrations*) and other travellers in the East call attention to the simplicity of these landmarks, a single stone or small heap of stones,—and the ease with which an aggressor could encroach without detection.—A.].

Ver. 11. *For their avenger* is a strong one, *i. e.*, Jehovah, who appears as the vindicator of outraged innocence (as גֹּאֵל, Job xix 25; Jer. l. 34, *etc.*), when human deliverers and protectors are wanting to it. (For illustration of human "redeemers" comp. Ruth iii 12). With *b* compare xxii. 28; also Ps. lxviii. 6: Mal. iii. 5, *etc.*

3. Vers. 12-18. Admonition to the strict training of children, and to the striving after true wisdom and the fear of God —**Apply thine heart to correction** For this phrase "to apply the heart. to incline the heart," comp. Ps. xc. 12, *b*; for the "words of knowledge," chap. i. 2.

Ver 12 can hardly be regarded as an introduction to all that follows as far as chap xxiv. 2 (in opposition to BERTHEAU); rather does the general exhortation contained in it, to the reception of a discipline of the understanding, prepare the way only for what immediately follows, —perhaps as far as ver. 16, or 18.

Ver. 13. Comp iii 27, xix 18, xxii. 15.

Ver. 14. **And his soul thou deliverest from hell** *i e.*, so far forth as correction leads to life. and is even itself life, comp iv. 13; xv. 24: also vii. 27 sq., ix 18

Ver. 15, 16 **My son, if thine heart becometh wise.** *i e.*, if it as the result of wholesome discipline shall have become wise —**My heart will rejoice, even mine**—therefore not thine merely For the repetition of the suffix which expresses the genitive relation, by the *casus rectus*, compare, 1 Kings xxi. 1. 9; 2 Sam. xvii. 5; xix 1, and also chap xxii 19 above. The "reins" in 16, *a*, are plainly only an interchangeable expression for "heart" (Ps. xvi. 7; xvii. 3), and the "right speaking of the lips" is the necessary effect or the outward sign of having become wise.

Ver 17. **Let not thine heart press on eagerly after sinners, but after the fear of Jehovah all the day.** Thus SCHELLING, UM-

Digitized by Google

BREIT, HITZIG, [K.] correctly render, while the greater number, following the LXX, Vulg., *etc.*, restrict the effect of the verb קַנֵּא to the first member, and for the second supply the Imper. of the substantive verb. For the general idea moreover comp. iii. 31; xxiv. i. 19. [HOLDEN gives a qualified endorsement to the interpretation which our author adopts; (N., M., S. follow the E. V) in the line of the LXX rendering.—RUEETSCHI supports the view which makes the one expressed verb common to the two clauses, the shades of meaning varying as a person is the object in the former, a thing in the latter clause; in the former case the idea is very nearly that of "envy," in the latter "to be zealous for." A more delicate point discussed by R. is the peculiarity of the compound connective כִּי אִם, in ver. 17 and again in ver. 18. In the former it is hardly more than the simple adversative "but" (see EWALD, *Lehrb.* 343, *b*); in the latter (see Z's. view below), it must be virtually a causal "for," or by conjectural emendation = כִּי אָז, "for then," (as above, p. 157).—A.].

Ver. 18. **For if the end come.** So UMBREIT, BERTHEAU, ELSTER correctly render, for the connective is here not "rather" or "but rather" as in ver. 17, but כִּי is a causal (comp. xxiv. 20), and אִם supplies a condition, as in the similar passage xxiv. 14. The "end" is not specifically the hour of death (UMBREIT) but the terminus which is necessarily reached in all human relations (ELSTER), the hour of judicial decision, when God fulfils the hopes of the pious but visits the ungodly with righteous penalties. So far forth as this decisive end is ordinarily reached not till the future life, there is undoubtedly a hint of the hope of immortality and of a future retribution involved in this passage, as in xi. 7; xiv. 32.

4. Vers. 19-25. Warning against intemperance and extravagance, and counsel to an obedient endeavor after truth.—**Hear thou, my son, and be wise.** The pronoun is added to strengthen the appeal in the Imper. "hear" for the sake of the contrast with the disobedient in vers. 20 sq.—**And incline thine heart in a right way,** lit. "and let thine heart go straight forward in the way" (*i. e.*, in the "way of understanding" chap. ix. 6). Comp. Job xxxi. 7.

Ver. 20. **Who devour much flesh.** This conception of the Hebrew phrase is the simplest and best supported by the authority of all the old translators. We are to think of gluttons who at their carousals with much wine consume also much flesh. Comp. vii. 14; ix. 2; and for the association of זוֹלֵל "waster, consumer," with סֹבֵא, "drunkard," comp. also Deut. xxi. 20, as well as the expression of the New Testament, φάγος καὶ οἰνοπότης, Matth. xi. 19, which seems to be a free rendering of this fixed formula. It is arbitrary and contrary to the meaning of זולל as established in the usage of the language, when EWALD and UMBREIT refer it to licentious voluptuaries, who "dishonor or destroy their own body." Of the later commentators BERTHEAU, ELSTER, HITZIG have taken the right view. [The author is perhaps too summary in his way of dismissing an interpretation, which has the support of Hebraists and expositors like GESEN., FUERST, DE W., N.; and yet we concur in his view, which is best supported by scriptural parallels, and is that favored by the LXX, Vulg., LUTHER, E. V., H., S., M., WORDSW., *etc.*—A.]

Ver. 21. **And the sleep of sloth clotheth in rags.** The noun נוּמָה, "sleep," which occurs only here, according to the context describes the indolence and drowsiness into which the drunkard and glutton sinks in consequence of his excesses, and the necessary result of which is poverty.

Ver. 22. **Hearken to thy father that hath begotten thee,**—and for that reason deserves obedience, as does the mother also, to whom, according to clause *b*, it is becoming to hearken in the time of her old age.

Ver. 23. **Buy truth and sell it not.** The "buying" of the truth consists in the acquisition of it with labor, exertion and sacrifice (comp. iv. 5, 7; xvi. 16; Matt. xiii. 44, 46). The "selling" of it would consist in its gross disparagement, and its sacrifice for the sake of sensual enjoyment, or any unsubstantial seeming treasure. ["Give up everything for truth," says Dr CHALMERS, "and let no bribery of any sort induce me to surrender it."]

Ver. 24. **The father of a righteous man rejoiceth greatly.** The K'ri is unquestionably to be preferred to the K'thibh, while in clause *b* we ought probably to give the preference rather to the K'thibh; we render therefore literally, "the begetter of a wise man—and he shall rejoice in himself."—With respect to the sentiment of this verse and the one following comp. x. 1; xv. 20; xxvii. 11.

5. Vers. 26-28. Warning against licentiousness, introduced by a summons to a loving consecration to wisdom.—**My son, give me thine heart.** The speaker is evidently wisdom personified, who appears here as in chap. vii. 4, 5, in opposition to a treacherous harlot, and admonishes to a firm adherence to her "ways," *i. e.* to the principles and rules of life which are prescribed by wisdom.

Ver. 27. With *a* compare xxii. 14 *a*.—**And the strange woman a narrow pit;** therefore, those that have been ensnared by her artifices and brought to ruin, she releases again with as much difficulty as a narrow and deep well (possibly of a conical, or, the reverse, a funnel shape) permits one who has fallen into it to escape.

Ver. 28. **Yea, like a robber doth she lie in wait.** חֶתֶף is used only here to describe a robber. Comp Jer. iii. 2, where a wanton harlot is compared to an "Arab of the desert" lurking about the roads.—**And the false among men doth she multiply;** *i. e.* by her seductive arts she allures many to unfaithfulness, especially when it is married men among whom she practises her impurities. UMBREIT unnecessarily renders: she draweth to herself faithless ones (*i. e.* adulterers);—besides, the verb here used could hardly express this idea. But it is likewise inappropriate, with EWALD, BERTHEAU,

Digitized by Google

ELSTER, *etc.*, to understand by the "faithless" not so much adulterers, *etc.*, as rather robbers and murderers. No sufficient support from the language can be adduced for HITZIG's conception of בוגדים as equivalent to the abstract בגדה "perfidy, faithlessness."

6. Vers. 29-35. **Warning against the vice of intemperance, by means of a vivid picture of its ruinous results.—Who hath woe? Who hath grief?** Lit., "to whom is ah? to whom alas?" The interjection אבוי, an expansion of אוי is found only here. Among the subsequent terms, the "trouble" is strictly anxious care, complaint; "wounds without cause" are wounds received in causeless or wholly unprofitable disputes, wounds and stripes such as come of the brawls of drunken men; finally the dark "redness of the eyes" is the revolting effect of excessive use of wine as it shows itself in the face, according to Gen. xlix 12.

Ver. 30. **They that tarry long at the wine** (comp. Isa. v. 11), **who come to seek mixed wine.** There is hardly need of our supposing (in accordance with BERTHEAU's view) an actual entrance into a proper wine store or cellar (Song Sol. ii. 4),—but rather a concourse of several at the house of some one (comp. Job i. 4), to drink there strong spiced wine or mixed liquor (ix. 5).

Ver. 31. **When it sparkleth in the cup** (lit., "giveth out or showeth its eye"), **when it glideth smoothly** (lit., "goeth a straight or right way," *ingreditur blande* (Vulg.)). Comp. Song Sol. vii. 10. [The figurative use of the term "eye" in this vivid description has suggested two slightly different conceptions;—one, that of BÖTT., *etc.*, derived from the *brightness* of the eye; the other, that of FUERST, *etc.*, from its *roundness*, setting forth therefore the "bead, or pearl" of the wine. Two different interpretations have likewise been given to the latter part of the description; one of these is based upon the smooth flow in the glass of rich, oily old wine (so E. V., W., *etc.*); the other upon its smooth pleasant flow as it is swallowed, when "it goeth down aright" (so substantially LUTHER, DE W., K., Z., BERTHEAU, H., N., S., M.). The LXX gives a curiously divergent rendering: "For if thou shouldest set thine eyes on bowls and cups, thou shalt afterwards go more naked than a pestle."—A.]

Ver. 32. **At last it biteth like a serpent;** lit., "its end," *i. e.* its ruinous influence which finally becomes evident, its fearful after-pangs. **—And stingeth like an adder.** This Hiphil form, which occurs only here, can, in accordance with the Aramæan, have no other meaning than "to sprinkle, or spirt," for which in the case before us "poison" suggests itself as the natural object: (the serpent is the very poisonous species of viper mentioned also in Isa. xi. 8).

Ver. 33. **Thine eyes shall see strange things.** The "strange" (זרות) standing parallel with "perverse (things)," is evidently to be taken in a different sense from that required in xxii. 14; it therefore does not denote "strange women" (UMBREIT, BERTHEAU, ELSTER), but "strange, marvellous things," as the object of the drunken man's vision; thus, *e. g.*, the doubling of certain objects, their inversion, their tremulous or swaying motion, *etc.* (thus, correctly, ROSENM., EWALD, HITZIG).—With clause *b* compare xv. 28. [While the Book of Proverbs emphasizes the connection of drunkenness and licentiousness as kindred, and often contemporaneous or successive vices (see especially chap. vii.), still the rendering suggested by xxii. 14, and preferred by the E. V., DE W., N., M., H., S., *etc.*, is rendered less probable by the parallelism, which in Hebrew is not to be lightly disregarded.—A.]

Ver. 34. **And shalt be as one who** (is) **in the midst of the sea,**—*i. e.* probably not one who is out in the midst of the high sea (so UMBREIT, BERTHEAU, *etc.*), but one who is in the depths of the sea (Jonah ii. 4), and therefore one who is as unconscious, with the spirit as completely removed from all previous surroundings, as a drowned man lying upon the deep sea-bottom (HITZIG). [KAMPH., H., N., S., M. take the other view, which has this to commend it, that it refers to more common experiences, and experiences of living men, and harmonizes better with the second part of the description.—A.]—**As one that sleepeth on the top of a mast,**—a lively image of the condition of the drunken man, reeling, staggering hither and thither, rising and falling, as it were, and so exposed to imminent perils to his life. חבל "mast," (which is usually described by תרן), a word occurring only here, and apparently related to the verb חבל, "to bind;" comp. Dan. iv. 20. [FUERST makes the primary meaning "to conduct, direct, guide," and therefore interprets the noun of the "steering apparatus, the rudder."—A.]

Ver. 35. **They have stricken me—I have not felt it,** *etc.* Evidently language of the intoxicated man, who first, in clauses *a* and *b*, tells how he feebly remembers having experienced, without really feeling, even blows and bodily abuse of other kinds, while he was in his intoxication,—and then in clause *c*, although still half-bewildered by the later influence of the wine, expresses his intense craving for more, and his fixed purpose to seek anew the prohibited enjoyment. The more characteristic this whole picture of the mode of thought and action of a confirmed inebriate, so much the more unnecessary is it, with HITZIG, to read in *a* and *b* "it hath stricken—it hath smitten me" (הלמני הכני) and to make wine personified (as in ver. 32) the subject.—With *c* compare, moreover, the language of the sluggard craving sleep; chap. vi. 10.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

There is hardly need of further demonstration to show, that it is several of the main forms of sensual self-indulgence of which our chapter treats in the way of warning and dissuasion. At first it is a very strong desire for the pleasures of great men's tables, as well as for the enjoyments and advantages which intercourse with envious men secures (vers. 1-3, 6-8), that forms the subject of the admonition. The remonstrance in-

Digitized by Google

terposed between these two warnings, and relating to striving after riches, points to covetousness as the deep root not only of evils in general, but of this one in particular (vers. 4, 5; comp. 1 Tim. vi. 10).—[LAWSON:—Solomon often speaks of riches as a reward that wisdom frequently bestows on those who love her, but here he cautions us against supposing that wisdom encourages the love of riches]. There follows next a further warning against common, rude and uncultivated conversation (ver. 9).—[CHALMERS:—Let me know when to be silent as well as when to speak. There is a manifest contempt for what is said that should lay instant arrest upon me]. There is a like warning against the rough and greedy exercise of violence upon helpless orphans, and others who are weak and entitled to consideration (vers. 10, 11); against foolish doting, and a false carnal forbearance in the matter of the discipline of children (vers. 12-18);—[ARNOT:—The command is framed upon the supposition that parents often fail on the side of tenderness; the word is given to nerve them for a difficult duty. There is no ambiguity in the precept; both the need of correction and the tremendous issues that depend on it are expressed with thrilling precision of language];—next, against haughty contempt of the consideration due to parents, and disobedience to them (vers. 22-25); against intercourse with the gluttonous and profligate (vers. 19-21); against being ensnared by wanton women (vers. 26-28); against the vice of drunkenness (vers. 29-35). As a basis for the warning against these two chief forms of incontinence and fleshly indulgence we have at one time more prominence given to the nothingness and transientness of the possessions or enjoyments to be obtained by means of them (vers. 5, 21, 35), and at another to the heavy penalty in temporal and eternal death (vers. 11, 14, 18, 27 sq., 32). To the foolish sentiments and manner of life which lead down to such ruin, ver. 17, which is cast in a peculiarly comprehensive form, opposes the "fear of Jehovah," as the only means of deliverance and preservation. And as the glorious fruit and result of this we have extolled in ver. 18 a hope which outlasts the grave and death,—the same hope, therefore, of an eternally blessed life, which in some earlier passages of the Book of Proverbs had already come out significantly; comp. above, remarks on this passage, on p. 202.

HOMILETIC AND PRACTICAL.

Homily on the entire chapter:—The fear of God the only safeguard against the ruinous ascendency of fleshly lusts, especially avarice, extravagance, drunkenness and licentiousness.—Comp. STÖCKER: On intemperance in eating and drinking.—*Berleburg Bible:*—The art of living well, according to the rules of wisdom.

Vers. 1-3. LUTHER (marginal):—At court there is deceitful bread, for one is ever out-lying and out-flattering another that he may bring him down, and himself up. . . . It is bad eating cherries with lords.—MELANCHTHON:—To be seeking offices and positions of service with great men is allowable if we know ourselves to be in some measure fitted for it; yet one striving for these may never restrain the independent judgment of him who has the choice, or in general seek to attain its end by unjust means: otherwise it is a guilty ambition.—HASIUS:—He that cannot walk prudently in dangerous places does better to keep away from them.—GEIER:—At the table of the Lord's grace in the Holy Sacrament, one should appear with special reverence and humility; for there one has to do with the King of all kings.—STARKE:—Moderation and the careful testing of that which is and that which is not hurtful to the body must always be the rule of prudence, even though one have great stores on hand.—[ARNOT:—It is of the Lord that hunger is painful and food gives pleasure; between these two lines of defence the Creator has placed life with a view to its preservation. The due sustenance of the body is the Creator's end; the pleasantness of food the means of attaining it. When men prosecute and cultivate that pleasure as an end, they thwart the very purposes of Providence].

Vers. 4, 5. MELANCHTHON:—Diligence, industry, faithful striving to fulfil one's earthly calling this proverb does not forbid, but multiplicity of cares and a greedy eagerness under which man, from want of confidence in God, seeks with pain and self-imposed smart for the perishable goods of this world. From such wayward and unlawful striving it summons us back to the true sphere of our calling and to a prudent and diligent work therein with appeals for divine aid.—*Tübingen Bible:*—To toil for riches which are perishable and cannot satisfy the soul, is a sinful folly. In heaven should we be gathering treasures that endure forever, Matt. vi. 19 sq.—[T. ADAMS:—Solomon compares riches not to some tame house bird, or a hawk that may be fetched down with a line, or found again by her bells; but an eagle that violently cuts the air and is gone past recalling.—BP. HOPKINS:—It were a most strange folly to fall passionately in love with a bird upon his wing, *etc.* How much better were it, since riches will fly, for thyself to direct their flight towards heaven, by relieving the necessitous servants and members of Jesus Christ?]

Vers. 6-8. ZELTNER:—Learn to be pleased and content at little cost, and thou wilt be able easily to forget dainty morsels. Follow Paul: I have learned in whatsoever state I am therewith to be content (Phil. iv. 11).—WOHLFARTH:—Reflect how much ruin envy works, this annoyance at others' prosperity,—how it spares no means for the overthrow of the envied neighbor, how unhappy and discontented it also makes even its own slaves, to what grievous sins it forces them, *etc.* Consider this, and thou wilt not merely take to heart the prudential maxim: Beware of the envious,—but thou wilt seek to keep thyself also from this vice!

Vers. 9 sq. STARKE (on ver. 9):—To speak at the wrong time and in the wrong place brings always far more harm than profit.—(On vers. 10, 11):—Pious widows and orphans have, notwithstanding their forsaken and apparently helpless condition, the mightiest protection; Ecclesiast. xxxv. 16 sq.—(On ver. 12):—Not simply instruction, but also correction and punishment one must receive gladly if one would become wise.

Digitized by Google

Vers. 13-18. LUTHER (marginal comm. on ver. 13):—If thou scourgest thy son the executioner need not scourge him. There must be scourging once; if the father does not do it, then Master John does it; there is no help for it. No one has ever escaped it, for this is God's judgment.—J. LANGE:—Many parents deserve hell in their own children, because they have neglected to train them in holiness.—CRAMER (on ver. 15):—Next to the experience of God's grace there is no greater joy on earth than when one finds joy and honor in his children.—[H. MELVILL:—If a child do that which will make a parent happier he does that which will also make himself so. Heart-wisdom is the thing desired. No wisdom is thought worthy of the name that has not heaven for its origin and end, and the heart for its abode.—TRAPP (on ver. 17):—Men must wake with God, walk with Him, and lie down with Him, be in continual communion with Him, and conformity unto Him. This is to be in heaven aforehand.—BP. HOPKINS:—It is the property of grace and holiness, when there are no actual explicit thoughts of God, then to be habitually in the fear of God, possessing the heart and overawing it].—STARKE (on ver. 18):—The true good of the pious is still future; so much the less may they be enamored of the present seeming good of the ungodly.—REINHARD (*Gesam. Predd.*, Bd. II., 1804; Sermon on vers. 17, 18):—How much cause we have to hold true to the old unchangeable principles of a genuine fear of God.—SACKREUTER (Fast-day Sermon on vers. 17, 18,—see "*Sonntagsfeier*," 1839):—Of three excellent preservatives from sin, *viz.:* 1) the avoidance of evil example; 2) reverence for God; 3) frequent remembrance of the blessing of virtue.

Vers. 19 sq. [TRAPP (on ver. 19):—Let knowledge and affection be as twins, and run parallel; let them mutually transfuse life and vigor, the one into the other.—JOHN FOSTER:—On the self-discipline suitable to certain mental states].—*Tübingen Bible* (on ver. 20, 21):—Gluttony and drunkenness are works of the flesh; they that do such things cannot inherit the kingdom of God, Gal. v. 19.—LANGE (on ver. 22):—In the eyes of wicked children nothing is wont to seem more worthy of contempt than the old mother; and yet he is accursed of the Lord who troubles his mother, Ecclesiast. iii. 18.—SAURIN (on ver. 23):—The investigation of truth involves the seven following duties: 1) be attentive; 2) do not be discouraged at labor; 3) suspend your judgment; 4) let prejudice yield to reason; 5) be teachable; 6) restrain your avidity of knowing; 7) in order to edify your mind subdue your heart.—[A. FULLER:—Solomon does not name the price of truth, because its value was beyond all price. Buy it at any rate! It cannot be too dear! And having got it make much of it! sell it not, no, not for any price!]—ZELTNER (on vers. 26 sq.):—The best and most welcome present that thou canst bring thy God is thy heart with all its desires and powers. Is it ruined? He alone can amend and cleanse it.—STARKE:—He who opens his heart to the prince of this world thereby shows himself the enemy of God and of eternal wisdom.—[BP. HOPKINS:—Whatever else we tender unto God if the heart be wanting, it is but the carcass of a duty].

Vers. 29-35. CRAMER:—All sins come in agreeably and taste well in the mouth; but afterward they are as bitter as gall, and fatal as the poison of vipers.—OSIANDER:—Wine is a noble gift of God; but its abuse is only the more ruinous, and therefore to be shunned like deadly poison.—STARKE:—That man only is really and in the spiritual sense drunken who does not discern the great peril of his soul, but under all correction becomes only the more confident and defiant (Jer. v. 3).—[TRAPP:—Such is the drunkard's lethargy; neither is he more insensible than sensual and irrecoverable.—LAWSON:—An inferior master in the art of moral painting gives us a just picture of drunkenness in these words, "Drunkenness is a distemper of the head, a subversion of the senses, a tempest of the tongue, a storm in the body—the shipwreck of virtue, the loss of time, a wilful madness, a pleasant devil, a sugared poison, a sweet sin, which he that has has not himself, and he that commits it, doth not only commit sin, but is himself altogether sin"].

---

d) Warning against intercourse with wicked and foolish men.

CHAP. XXIV. 1-22.

1 Be not envious of evil men,
and desire not to be with them,
2 for their heart studieth violence,
and their lips talk of mischief.—
3 By wisdom is the house builded,
and by understanding is it established;
4 by knowledge shall the chambers be filled
with all treasure that is precious and pleasant.

Digitized by Google

5 The wise man is full of strength,
and the man of understanding increaseth strength;
6 for with wise counsel shalt thou make war,
and victory is in abundance of counsellors.—
7 Wisdom is too high for the fool;
he openeth not his mouth in the gate.
8 He that deviseth to do evil
shall be called a mischievous person.
9 The device of folly is sin,
and the scorner is an abomination to men.
10 If thou faint in the day of adversity
thy strength is small.
11 Deliver them that are taken to death,
and them that totter toward destruction, oh rescue them!
12 If thou sayest, Lo, we knew it not!
He that weigheth hearts will He not mark it?
He that watcheth over thy soul, will He not know it?
and He requiteth man according to his work.
13 My son, eat honey because it is good,
and honey comb which is sweet to thy taste;
14 so acquaint thyself with wisdom for thy soul;
when thou hast found it and the end cometh
thy hope also shall not be cut off.
15 Plot not as a wicked man against the dwelling of the righteous,
assault not his dwelling-place;
16 for seven times doth the righteous fall and riseth again,
but the wicked shall plunge into destruction.
17 When thine enemy falleth rejoice not,
and if he stumbleth let not thine heart be glad;
18 lest Jehovah see it, and it be evil in His eyes,
and He turn away His anger from him.—
19 Be not enraged at evil doers,
envy not the wicked.
20 For no future shall there be to the evil;
the light of the wicked shall be put out.
21 My son, fear thou Jehovah and the King,
and go not with those who are given to change;
22 for suddenly shall their calamity rise,
and the destruction of them both, who knoweth it?

GRAMMATICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 6. לְךָ a *dativus commodi* ["for thyself, thy advantage or interest"]; comp. לָמוֹ, chap. xxiii. 20.

Ver. 7. רָאמוֹת, *scriptio plena*, as in 1 Chron. vi. 58; Zech. xiv. 10. [Comp. GREEN, § 156, 3, *etc.*].

Ver. 8. For the construction of קָרָא with לְ comp. xvi. 21.

Ver. 11. אִם stands here for לוּ, *utinam*, as in Ps. lxxxi. 9; cxxxix. 19; it is not to be regarded (as the LXX, Vulg., UMBREIT, *etc.*, take it) as a negative particle of adjuration, in the sense of μη, *ja nicht*, by no means. [See also FUERST, *sub v.* For the time implied in the Part. לְקֻחִים, comp. rem. on xxii. 15; such as have been taken and are now in that condition. For the full form תַּחְשׂוֹךְ comp. Crit. Notes on xxii. 7, 8.—A.].

Ver. 13. [נֹפֶת an apparent fem. construed here as masc. See BÖTT. § 648, *b*, and n. 1.—A.].

Ver. 14. דְּעֶה or as the best MSS. read, דֵּעֶה is an Imper. from יָדַע instead of the usual form דְּעָה. [Comp. BÖTT. §§ 396, 956, *c*, 960, *a*; and GREEN, §§ 97, 1, *b*, 148, 3.—A.].

Ver. 17. [For the form בִּכָּשְׁלוֹ instead of the fuller Niphal form, see BÖTT. §§ 990, 1, *b*, 1036, 2; and GREEN, §§ 91, *b*, 231, 5, *a*.—A.].

EXEGETICAL.

1. Vers. 1, 2. Warning against intercourse with wicked men (lit. "men of evil," comp. xxviii. 5;) comp. ver. 19; xxiii. 17; with ver. 1, *a*, comp. also xxiii. 3, 6; with 2, *a*, comp. xv. 28.

2. Vers. 3-6. Praise of wisdom and its salutary results.—**By wisdom is the house builded.** Comp. xiv. 1, where it is specifically the wisdom

Digitized by Google

of woman that is commended as builder of the house. For the expression in 8, *b*, comp. iii. 19; for ver. 4 comp. also iii. 10; viii. 21.

Ver. 5. **The wise man is full of strength,** lit., is "in strength," *i. e.*, furnished with strength, powerful; comp. the corresponding phrase in Ps. xxix. 4. The LXX, Syr., Chald., read מֵעֹז, *i. e.*, more than, better than strength; comp. xvi. 32. But the Masoretic reading plainly gives us a simpler and more pertinent meaning.—**And the man of understanding** (lit. "man of knowledge") **increaseth strength,** lit., "maketh power strong," (comp. ii. 14) he develops mighty strength (comp. the phrase in Job ix. 19), he makes it available as a quality of his own.

Ver. 6. **For with wise counsel must thou make war,** lit. "must thou carry on war for thyself." *i. e.*, must thou bring thy war to an end, carry it through. [So M., Wordsw., K., *etc.*]. Comp. xx. 18, and for clause *b*, xi. 14; xv. 22.

3. Vers. 7-10. Four separate proverbs, directed against folly, intrigue, scoffing and faint-heartedness.—**Wisdom is too high for the fool.** רָאמוֹת is strictly "heights" (*excelsa*, Vulg.), *i. e.*, unattainably distant things, objects which are altogether too high; comp. Ps. x. 5; Isa. xxx. 18. Hitzig conjectures a double meaning, so far forth as the word in the form before us could have meant at the same time also "corals, costly ornaments" (in accordance with Job xxviii. 18).—**He openeth not his mouth in the gate;** *i. e.*, in judicial consultations and transactions of his fellow-citizens (comp. xxii. 22) he can bring forward nothing. ["He were two fools if he should," says Trapp, "for while he holds his tongue he is held wise"].

Ver. 8. **Shall be called** (him they call) **a mischievous person**—a master or lord of mischief (an expression equivalent to that in chap. xii. 2, "a man of wicked devices"). ["This is his property and ownership, mischief and wrong." Wordsw.]

Ver. 9. **The device** (meditation) **of folly is sin;**—*i. e.*, there also where folly (or the fool, *abstr. pro concr.*) acts with consideration, and goes to work with a reflective prudence (זִמָּה, a similar term to that in ver. 8), it still brings to pass nothing good, but always only evil. It is indeed even worse with the scoffer, who, according to clause *b*, is an abhorrence and abomination to all men, because he, with his evil plans and counsels, unites furthermore great shrewdness, subtle wit, refined speculation—in general the exact opposite of folly.

Ver. 10. **If thou hast shown thyself faint in the day of adversity** (anxiety, distress), **thy strength is small;**—*i. e.*, thou art a coward and weakling, whose courage is feeble, and whose moral power and capacity for resistance is, as it were, crippled. Less appropriately Umbreit, Elster, *etc.* (following the Vulg., Targum, *etc.*) "then sinketh thy strength also" (*imminuetur fortitudo tua*). But Hitzig's emendation is also needless, רוּחֲכָה, "thy courage," for כֹּחֲכָה, "thy strength,"—as is also his marvellous reproduction of the *paronomasia* (צָר—צָרָה) by: "*am Tage der Klemme—klamm ist dein Muth*" ["in the day of straits—straight is thy courage"]. Bertheau connects the verse closely with the two following: "Hast thou shown thyself faint in the day of trouble, was thy strength fearful, oh deliver," *etc.* (?). At all points Ewald has the right view, and in general Luther also: "He is not strong who is not firm in need." [The principle is familiar enough that courage and hopefulness are half of man's strength.—A.]

4. Vers. 11, 12. An admonition to a sympathizing and compassionate demeanor toward such as are in their innocency condemned to death, and are being borne to the place of execution. Comp. L. Mosheim: *Commentatio ad loc.* Prov. xxiv. 11, 12; Helmstadt. 4to. [Kamph. suggests an easy and natural transition to this exhortation from the preceding. That had reference to courage in time of one's own need, this to quick and sympathizing helpfulness in others' extremity.—A.]—**Deliver them that are taken to death** (the participle here used has the same meaning as the forms of the verb found in Isa. lvii. 18; Ps. xlix. 16). That this appeal is made specifically to a judge (Umbreit), is, according to ver. 12 *a*, very improbable. He who is addressed seems rather to be one who is accidentally passing by in the vicinity of the place of execution, who is on the point of going on after the manner of the priest and the Levite in Luke x. 30 sq., with no sympathy, and without lifting a helping hand. That the author of the proverb, notwithstanding the singular which is immediately employed, still has in his eye a plurality, a whole host of such passers by, appears from the "Lo, we know it not," which in ver. 12, *a*, he supposes to be the answer to his appeal. Hitzig's assumption is arbitrary, that the hard-hearted judges are Persians, and those who are in their innocence condemned to death, Jews, or Syrians, Samaritans, or some other Persian subjects of the period next succeeding the exile, possibly of the time of Ezra (ix. 9). The same is true likewise of Bertheau's opinion that there is no reference whatever to a judicial execution, but to a bloody battle, during which one ought courageously to protect those assailed by the foe, and not timidly to leave them to the threatening destruction. [Hardly any two of our English expositors agree as to the structure of this sentence, although they are nearly or quite unanimous in explaining its general meaning. N. and M. agree with the E. V. in making the first verb an Infinitive (which is possible) depending on the final verb of the sentence; E. V.: "if thou forbear to deliver," *etc.*; N.: "to deliver, *etc.*, spare thyself not;" M.: "dost thou forbear to deliver," *etc.* H., S. and Wordsw. agree with our author in making it an Imper., although H. and W. make the last clause conditional, like 12, *a*. The explanation of Z., S., Kamph., *etc.*, is probably to be preferred which makes the אִם a particle of wishing, and the verb transitive rather than reflexive or neuter.—A.].—**Lo! we knew it not!**—Hitzig, in agreement with the LXX, "Lo, we know him not!" But in verse 11 there is plainly enough mention made of a number who are dragged to death. [As Kamph. suggests, the time when a plea of ignorance could fitly be put in, as well as the nature of the plea itself, tells

Digitized by Google

against this personal interpretation. And it is also to be observed how idle the plea of ignorance becomes when it is God rather than man to whom one's omissions are to be justified.—A.] **And he will requite man according to his work.**—The interrogative הֲלֹא of the second clause plainly has no further influence on this general sentence which concludes (comp. Ps. lxii. 13; Job xxxiv. 11; Rom. ii. 6).

5. Vers. 13, 14. Admonition to a diligent striving after wisdom.—**My son, eat thou honey because it is good,** *etc.*—A figurative injunction of a preparatory sort, serving as a basis for the admonition to strive after wisdom, contained in ver. 14. For this figure of honey and the honey-comb as the designation of something especially lovely and agreeable, comp. Ps. xix. 11.

Ver. 14. **So acquaint thyself with wisdom also for thy soul;**—lit., "know wisdom for thy soul, appropriate it to thyself, recognized as precious and exceedingly palatable!" [The E. V., following the Vulg., takes the peculiar form of the Imperf. for a peculiar form of the noun "knowledge," and supplies the substantive verb. H. and M. are in the same error —A.]—**When thou hast found it, and the end cometh.**—This last clause is still part of the conditional protasis, corresponding to the common use of אִם יֵשׁ, to introduce a conditional clause; comp. Gen. xxiii. 8; xxiv. 49; Judges vi. 36, *etc.* For making it a transition to the apodosis ("then cometh an end—then a future remaineth"—Hitzig, following the LXX, Vulg., Luther, *etc.* [so K.; E. V: "then there shall be a reward;" so also H., N., M., W., while S. takes our author's view.—A.]), not a single supporting case can be cited, in which וְיֵשׁ introduces the apodosis, in the sense "then or so will be" (comp. Bertheau on this passage). For the general sentiment compare furthermore xxiii. 18.

6. Vers. 15–18. Warning against malicious violence and delight in mischief.—**Lie not in wait as a wicked man** (that is, with wicked and mischievous intent) **against the dwelling of the righteous; assault not** (verb as in xix. 26) **his resting place.**—Hitzig changes the verb in clause *a* to תַּקְרִב and the noun to רֶעַשׁ, and thus obtains the meaning: "Bring not alarm near to the dwelling of the righteous," *etc.* (?).—

Ver. 16. **For seven times doth the righteous fall and riseth again;**—*i. e.*, many a misfortune overtakes him in life, yet he gives way before none, but always comes up again (Hitzig). Comp. Ps. lxxxvii. 24; Jer. viii. 4; and with reference to the symbolical number *seven*, particularly Job v. 19.—**But the wicked shall plunge into destruction**—lit., "stumble, are brought to a downfall by calamity;" comp. chap. iv. 19.

Vers. 17, 18 are closely connected with both the verses preceding, not merely by the recurrence of the ideas "fall" and "plunge" (stumble), but also by the substance of the thought; for delight in injury is the twin sister to a plotting intrigue and violence.—**Lest Jehovah see it and it displease him**—lit., "and it be evil in his eyes."—**And He turn away His anger from him**—*i. e.*, from the enemy (מֵעָלָיו referring back to ver. 16, "thine enemy"), to turn it upon thee thyself instead of him.

7. Vers. 19–22. Warning against intercourse with wicked and seditious persons.—**Be not thou enraged at evil doers,**—*i. e.*, be not excited, envious (אַל־תִּתְחַר, "burn not," here equivalent to the "envy not" of ver. 1) with regard to the undeserved prosperity of ungodly men, which perhaps might only stimulate to the imitation of their wicked conduct; comp. Ps. xxxvii. 8; lxxiii. 2, 3; also Prov. i. 11 sq. [Fuerst and some others understand this of excitement, impatience *against* evil doers, which cannot wait for God's recompenses. This explanation, we think, is to be preferred here, although the other is clearly and frequently enough an injunction of the Scriptures.—A.]

Ver. 20. **For no future shall there be to the wicked.**—אַחֲרִית here in a different sense from that found in ver. 14 and in xxiii. 18. [The two ideas most frequently conveyed by this noun, which is literally an "after," something subsequent to the present, are a "future," and an "end or issue," *i. e.*, to present relations. It is this last idea that Z. finds in ver. 14 and xxiii. 18, the first in ver. 20. In the first two passages the "end" of the present suggests by implication and contrast a blessed future; this our verse denies to the wicked, not by implication, but by express assertion. It does not assert that he shall reach no end to his present relations, nor that he shall have no future whatever, but no future blessing. Some commentators are less exact in these discriminations, finding one general meaning in all the passages.—A.] With the general sentiment compare Job xx. 5; Ps. xxxvii. 2, 9, 38. With *b* in particular comp. chap. xiii. 9; xxi. 4.

Ver. 21. With *a* comp. Eccles. viii. 2 sq.; x. 20; 1 Pet. ii. 17.—**Go not with those who are given to change.**—שׁוֹנִים [cognate with שְׁנַיִם, two], those "otherwise disposed, wishing otherwise," *i. e.*, opposing [the present order], seditious, revolutionary (Vulg., *detractores*). "Go not with them," lit., "mingle thyself not," as in xx. 19.

Ver. 22. **And the destruction of them both**—*viz.*, of those who rebel against God and of those who rebel against the king. Others (Umbreit, Bertheau, *etc.* [De W., N., S., M., Wordsw., the genitive being treated as a genitive of source, "the ruin *proceeding from* them both"]; "and the penalty, the retribution of them both," *i. e.*, the punishment that goes forth from both, God and the king; Hitzig (in accordance with the Targ. and Syr.), "and the end of their years" (comp. Job xxxvi. 11). Our interpretation, as the simplest, is supported by the Vulg., Luther, Ewald, Elster [Kamph.]—**Who knoweth it?**—*i. e.*, who knows the time of their ruin; who knows how soon it will be precipitated? Comp. xvi. 14.

[The LXX, *etc.*, introduce here several verses for which there is no authority in the present Hebrew texts. "A son that keeps the father's commandment shall escape destruction; for such a one has fully received it. Let no falsehood be

Digitized by Google

spoken by the king from the tongue; yea, let no falsehood proceed from his tongue. The king's tongue is a sword, and not one of flesh; and whosoever shall be given up to it shall be destroyed; for if his wrath should be provoked, he destroys men with cords, and devours men's bones, and burns them up as a flame, so that they are not even fit to be eaten by the young eagles. My son, reverence my words, and receive them, and repent." Some of the editions also introduce at this point chap. xxx. 1-14.—A.]

DOCTRINAL, ETHICAL, HOMILETIC AND PRACTICAL.

To refer the ideas of this section, which are very various in their substance and their applications, to the one fundamental category of a "*Warning against intercourse with wicked and foolish men*," would not indeed answer in all respects and at all points; and yet the introductory and the concluding verses at least (vers. 1, 2, 19-22) do relate to this subject; and besides, the eulogiums upon wisdom which are interspersed (vers. 3-6, 7, 13, 14), and the counsels against malicious intrigue, mockery, trickery and delight in mischief (vers. 8, 9, 15 sq., 17 sq.), may without any peculiar violence be brought under the same classification. There remains isolated, therefore, only the censuring criticism on an unmanly, faint-hearted bearing in hours of peril (ver. 10), and the warning against a heartless indifference to those who are innocently suffering (vers. 11, 12). The latter passage in particular deserves attentive consideration, and a careful estimate of its practical bearings, for it belongs among those prefigurations and precursors of the distinctively Christian ethics, which occur somewhat rarely in the stage of revelation reached in the law of the Old Testament, and, in general, in any specific form in the literature of wisdom which centres in the name of Solomon. For even in a higher degree than the warning contained in vers. 17, 18 of our chapter, against delight in injury, in one's attitude towards his enemies,—and, if one is so disposed to view it, even in a higher degree than the demand of love to one's enemies in chap. xxv. 21 sq.,—does this powerful enforcement of the duty of a courageous protection and deliverance of the innocent who are doomed to death, correspond with the culmination of ethical justice, and the perfect fulfilling of the law, which Christ exhibits for the members of the New Covenant, in the narrative of the good Samaritan (Luke x. 30 sq), in His admonition to visit those in prison, and to the loving sacrifice of life itself in imitation of His own example, *etc.* (Matt. xxv. 36 sq.; John xii. 25; xv. 12-14). [Only a few of the exegetical and practical interpreters of our book have so well brought out this important point. LAWSON suggests it when he says: "The wise man represents this piece of charity as a duty which we owe to our neighbors without exception; and with him agrees our Lord in the parable of the good Samaritan. We are not the disciples of Solomon or of Christ if we show love to those only," *etc.* ARNOT puts the principle with more characteristic vigor: "Under God as Supreme ruler, and by His law, we owe every human being love; and if we fail to render it, we are cast into prison with other less reputable debtors. Nor will any thing be received in payment but the genuine coin of the kingdom; it must be love with a living soul in it and a substantial body on it."—A.]

In the *homiletic treatment of the whole passage* one might take just this demand that is contained in vers. 11, 12, of a compassionate love of one's neighbor, that will not shun even deadly perils, as the highest exemplification of wisdom, to the attainment and preservation of which all the counselling and dissuasory suggestions of the section summon us; the topic might then be announced: "Mercy the highest wisdom," or again: "The contrast between the wise man and the fool reaches its climax in the timid selfishness of the latter, and the former's self-sacrificing love for his neighbor."—Comp. STÖCKER: On patience and sociability. In what the virtue consists (ver. 1-12), and how one is to practise it (vers. 13 sq).—*Calwer Handb.*: Shun evil, choose wisdom.

Vers. 1 sq. *Tübingen Bible* (on vers. 1-2): It is one element in the prudence of the righteous to have no fellowship with the ungodly and to avoid their society.—LUTHER (marg. comment on vers. 3 sq.): When all is well ordered in a house it avails more than great labor; as, *e.g.*, when one gives, where, to whom, and as one ought, *etc.* —GEIER (on vers. 3 sq.): A household, if it is to be blessed, must not merely be wisely organized, but also prudently regulated and constructed.—Filling the chambers with temporal good is accounted great prosperity; but much more beautiful is it when the heart's chamber is filled with the treasures of heavenly wisdom and virtue.—(On vers. 5, 6): Strength of body without wisdom and prudence of heart, is like a giant who is robbed of the sight of his eyes.

Ver. 7-10. ZELTNER (on vers. 8, 9): As true piety has its degrees, so has ungodliness. But they are followed by righteous retribution and punishment.—STARKE (on ver. 10): Want and trouble is a genuine touchstone, with which one may determine how strong or how weak one is in faith and reliance on God.—VON GERLACH (same verse): In times of adversity the man whose strength stands fast in God has more power than usual. It is the fault of one's own indolence if this is not the case, though his strength be scanty and restricted.—[BP. HOPKINS: That thy patience may be perfect, it must be strong, as well as lasting. It must have nerves and sinews in it, to bear weighty burdens.]

Vers. 11, 12. MELANCHTHON: To unrighteous cruelty one should give no impulse; even private individuals ought, according to their strength and calling, to oppose tyrannical injustice without uproar or tumult.—GEIER: Man never lacks excuses; but many of them are by the Lord found to be too light, Luke xiv. 18 sq.—STARKE: To deliver men from bodily death is a great thing; but more glorious is it to aid a soul toward deliverance from spiritual and eternal death, James v. 20.

Vers. 13 sq. *Berleburg Bible* (on ver. 13): Charge it upon thyself that thou have such inward experience of wisdom, that thou shalt relish its sweetness like honey and the honey-comb.—STARKE (on ver. 16): To fall into sin and to fall

14

into calamity are two different things. Beware of the former, and the Lord will not forsake thee in the latter.—CRAMER: Whosoever rejoices in others' adversity, his own calamity stands already outside the door.—[T. ADAMS: Let us beware that we do not slide; if slide, that we do not fall; if fall, that we fall forward, not backward. Behold thy Saviour calling, thy Father blessing, the Spirit assisting, the angels comforting, the Word directing, the glory waiting, good men associating.—FLAVEL: Though repeated spiritual falling shows the foulness it does not always prove the falseness of the heart.—BRIDGES (on ver. 17): —What has grace done for us, if it has not overcome nature by a holier and happier principle? To rejoice in the fall of an enemy would be to fall deeper than himself; to fall not into trouble, but into sin.—TRAPP (on ver. 18):—Think thus with thyself, Either I am like my enemy, or else I am better or worse than he. If like him, why may I not look for the like misery? If better, who made me to differ? If worse, what reason have I then to insult?]

Vers. 19-22. STARKE (on vers. 19, 20):—He that would look on the prosperity of ungodly men without envy and offence need only make a comparison between the brief instant of their joy and the unending eternity of their pain and punishment.—ZOLLIKOFER (Serm. on vers. 19, 20):—Nullifying the objection against the divine government of the world, which is made on account of the unequal distribution of external prosperity among men, and the earthly well-being of the ungodly (therefore a *Theodicy*).—[ARNOT:—Here it is not the first and direct, but the secondary and circuitous effect of bad example, that is prominently brought into view. Some who are in no danger of falling in love with their neighbor's sin, may be chafed by it into a hatred of their neighbor].—MELANCHTHON (on ver. 21):—God has given to men authority because He would have men hear and know His law, and thereby Himself, and also for this reason, because He would preserve human society from dissolution through endless disquiets and controversies. He has, however, ordained that we hearken to human governors for His sake, and that we must know that He punishes the rebellious.—[Bp. SHERLOCK:—The only lasting foundation of civil obedience is the fear of God; and the truest interest of princes is to maintain the honor of religion, by which they secure their own.—ARNOT:—Take away godliness, and your loyalty without being increased in amount, is seriously deteriorated in kind; take away loyalty, and you run great risk of spoiling the purity of the remanent godliness. In the Scriptures the feebler force is made fast to the stronger, and so carried through in trying times. Loyalty is most secure where it has godliness to lean upon].—GEIER (on ver. 22):—Certain as death in itself is, although we cannot know the time and manner of it, so surely does God's punishment follow ungodliness and rebellion, but its time and form remain uncertain.

Second Supplement:

CHAP. XXIV. 23–34.

a) Various admonitions to good conduct toward one's neighbors.

VERS. 23–29.

23 These also are from wise men.
To be partial in judgment is not good.
24 He that saith to the wicked, "thou art righteous,"
him the people curse, (and) nations execrate;
25 but to them that rebuke (iniquity) it is well,
and upon them shall come a rich blessing.
26 He kisseth the lips
who giveth a right answer.
27 Set in order thy work without,
and make it ready for thyself in the field;
afterward build thine house.
28 Be not witness against thy neighbor without cause;
and wilt thou deceive with thy lips?
29 Say not: "As he hath done to me so will I do to him:
I will requite the man according to his work."

Digitized by Google

b) Warning against indolence and its evil consequences.

VERS. 30-34.

30 By the field of a slothful man I passed along,
and by the vineyard of a man void of understanding.
31 And, lo! it was all grown over with thorns,
briars covered the face thereof,
and its stone wall was broken down.
32 Then I looked and fixed my attention;
I saw and took (to myself) instruction.
33 "A little sleep, a little slumber,
a little folding of the hands to sleep;"—
34 then cometh thy poverty apace,
and thy want as an armed man!

GRAMMATICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 23. בַּל is equivalent to לֹא, as in xxii. 29; xxiii. 7, *etc.*

Ver. 27. [The Perf. with ו *consec.* וּבָנִיתָ is used, as this tense so construed not unfrequently is, in the sense of an Imperative: and afterward thou hast built, *etc.*; predictions and injunctions sometimes taking this way of expressing an assurance that what should be will be. See BÖTT. §§ 977, 3; 981, 3: GREEN, § 265, *b*; EWALD, *Lehrb.* 332, *b.*—A.]

Ver. 28. [A Perf. with ו *consec.* to express what *ought* to be,—a suggestion rather than a precept,—BÖTTCHER'S *Fiens debitum*, § 981, B. γ.] וְהִפִּתִיתָ. Because the interrogative particle occurs only in this instance immediately after the copula, EWALD proposes to change the form to וְהִפְתִּיתָ, "and thou wilt open wide," *i. e.* betray (comp. xx. 19), [so FUERST]; HITZIG, however, into וְהִפַּתּוֹתָ, "and thou wilt whisper," *i. e.* speak with subdued voice (from a form הִפַּת, to be explained in accordance with the Arabic); [so BÖTT., making it a Hiph. from פָּתַת and not a Piel from פָּתָה]. Both are alike arbitrary and unnecessary. [K., BERTHEAU, S. and M. take our author's view].

Ver. 31. [כֻּסּוּ, a Pual with Kamets Hhatuph; see GREEN, § 91, *a*; חֲרֻלִּים one of two examples in which וּ in the ultima gives place in forming the plural to ֻ with a doubled vowel. GREEN, 201, *c.*—A.]

EXEGETICAL.

1. Vers. 23-25. Warning against a partial administration of justice —**These also are from wise men.** According to the LXX, Vulg., MICHAELIS, UMBREIT, ELSTER, *etc.*, the לַחֲכָמִים should be understood "for the wise." [So the E. V., which is followed by HOLDEN]. In opposition to this we have not merely the usual meaning of the preposition in superscriptions, but over and above this we have the "also," which refers back to the next preceding collection of proverbs, whose originating with wise men was expressly emphasized, chap. xxii. 17.—**To be partial in judgment is not good**: strictly: to distinguish persons in judgment is not good. This short proverb, forming only a single clause, is plainly nothing but a preliminary observation or introduction to the two following verses, which treat more fully of partiality in dispensing justice. Compare, furthermore, the quite similar, and almost literally identical sentences, xviii. 5 and xxviii. 21.

Ver. 24. **He that saith to the wicked, "Thou art righteous."** Comp. chap. xvii. 15: "He that justifieth the wicked." To the threatening intimation of God's displeasure there given, there corresponds here the threat of a condition in which one is hated and cursed on the part of the nations (comp. xi. 26; xxii. 14); for to turn justice into injustice by partiality in judgment impairs the well-being of entire nations and states.

Ver. 25. **But to them that rebuke** (iniquity) **it is well**; *i. e.* upright judges who punish evil-doers according to their desert (not merely with words but also with stringent disciplinary enactments), instead of the curse of men, obtain as a reward nothing but blessing and welfare from God.

2. Vers. 26-29. Four additional admonitions to righteous conduct toward one's neighbors.—**He kisseth the lips that giveth a right answer**; *i. e.* faithful and truthful answers, especially before a court of justice, affect one as favorably as the most agreeable caress, or a sweet kiss on the lips. The mention of the "lips" is to be explained simply by the remembrance of the *question* to which the upright and truthful answer corresponds. The author of the proverb passes wholly by the fact that hearing is the appropriate organ for the reception of the answer. Therefore HITZIG's conception of the first clause, which differs from the common one: "He commends (ingratiates) himself with the lips who," *etc.*, is plainly unnecessary. [BERTHEAU, KAMPH., DE W., N., *etc.*, agree in our author's construction and conception; while the E. V., MUFFET, H., S., M., *etc.*, understand the allusion to be to tributes of love and honor *paid to him* who answers rightly: "Every man (or, the people) shall kiss his lips." According to this view the people's curse (in ver. 24) is contrasted with their respectful and loving salutation; according to the other, which is grammatically simpler and probably to be preferred, the offence given by the partial or partisan judge is contrasted with the cheering, soothing power of him who answers rightly.—A.]

Digitized by Google

Ver. 27. **Set in order thy work without;** *i. e.* take care, by the profitable and diligent prosecution of your labors in the field, first of all for the needful and reliable support of your existence; then you may go on to the building up of your establishment. The "house" in clause *c*, is thus doubtless equivalent to "family, domestic establishment," as in Ruth iv. 11; comp. above, Prov. xiv. 1. The literal rendering given by HITZIG and others to this phrase, "build thy house," seems less appropriate, although Biblical parallels might be adduced for this also, *e. g.* the passage Luke xv. 28, which in its moral bearing is certainly kindred.

Ver. 28. **Be not witness against thy neighbor without cause.** "Without cause," *i. e.* without an actual reason, without necessity; comp. xxiii. 29; xxvi. 2; John xv. 25, *etc.* It is not so much a false witness that is meant, as one not called for, one who is incited to say injurious things by nothing beyond his own animosity.—**And wilt thou deceive with thy lips?** See Critical notes for various constructions of the verb. With regard to the expression "deceive with thy lips," comp. Ps. lxxviii. 36; "and they did flatter him with their mouth."

Ver. 29. **Say not, "As he hath done to me so will I do to him."** We can hardly find here (with HITZIG, who follows several of the earlier expositors) a special connection between this verse and the preceding, as though the man who had been wronged by the officious witness were here introduced as speaking, and a warning were given him against allowing free course to his revenge. Comp. rather the similar thought in chap. xx. 22, which like this stands quite isolated.

3. Vers. 30-34. *The vineyard of the slothful:* a narrative in form closely resembling the parable. Comp. Isa. v. 1 sq., as well as the passages which correspond still more closely with the form of this narration, Job v. 3 sq.; Ps. xxxvii. 35 sq. —**By the field of a slothful man I passed along.** The figure of the field is in the sequel entirely dropped, from a preference for the closely related one of the vineyard. The "man void of understanding" in clause *b*, is naturally another sluggard, one who is indolent from lack of understanding.

Ver. 31. **And lo! it was all grown over with thorns** [lit., "it came up all of it thorns"] (comp. the same word in Isa. xxxiv. 13, which is there also translated in the Vulg. by the term *urticæ*), **brambles covered the face thereof** (חֲרֻלִּים, lit., "what one may not touch, things not to be approached" [FUERST, "stinging, burning things," nettles, *e. g.*], is an accusative subordinate to the verb in the Pual), **and its stone wall** (lit., "its wall of stones") **was broken down.** All these features are found also in the parable of the vineyard in Isaiah, which has been already cited, Isa. v. 5, 6; comp. likewise Ps. lxxx. 13, 14. [Travellers like HACKETT (*Illustrations of Scripture*) call attention to the minute accuracy of the description as illustrated by the fact, that in the richer soils of Palestine it is thorny shrubs, of which twenty-two kinds are enumerated, that are specially quick to spring up and overspread a neglected field.—A.]

Ver. 32. **Then I looked.** HITZIG proposes to read וָאֹחֲזָה instead of וָאֶחֱזֶה (comp. 2 Sam. iv. 10): "and I stopped" (from the intransitive verb אָחַז, *sistere*, to stand still). But the ordinary reading is abundantly confirmed by the parallel in clause *b*. [KAMPH. calls attention to the introduction of the pronoun, as an element in the graphic fullness of the poet's description of his meditation.—A.]—**I saw and took** (to myself) **instruction**, lit., "a correction or reproof." What was contained in this admonition is expressed in what follows.

With vers. 33, 34 comp. the almost literally identical verses 10 and 11 of chap. vi., and the Exeg. notes there (p. 84), where the meaning of the divergent reading was also discussed.—**And thy want:** lit., "and thy wants," *i. e.* thy deficits, thy pecuniary embarrassments, on account of which now one thing and then another fails.

DOCTRINAL, ETHICAL, HOMILETIC AND PRACTICAL.

Righteous treatment of one's neighbor, and a prudent active industry in the discharge of duties to ourselves, are the two points to which the admonitory import of this section may be reduced, and in a way quite exhaustive. For as vers. 23-29, all of them with the sole exception of ver. 28 admonish to a strictly just and honorable bearing in intercourse with others, so not merely that 28th verse, but also the parabolic narrative in vers. 30-34, relates to the vice of sloth and an indolent carelessness in the performance of the domestic duties of one's calling. The general substance of this short section therefore bears a resemblance, at least partial, to that of the 6th chapter (which is indeed much richer in its fullness). In attempting to obtain from it a central idea for *homiletic* use, we should be obliged to proceed as we did in that instance (comp., above, p. 87). [With reference to ver. 29 in particular (comp. what is said above on vers. 11, 12), Dr. CHALMERS says: It is pleasant to observe the outgoing of the earlier morality towards the later and more advanced—of that in the Old towards that in the New Testament.—A.] Therefore as a *homily on the whole:* Neither injustice nor faithlessness toward one's neighbor, nor want of fidelity in the fulfilment of one's own domestic duties, brings a blessing.—Or, Honorable conduct in relation to others is possible only on the basis of the industrious and conscientious performance of the duties of one's own calling.

Vers. 23-25. STARKE: An unjust judge loads himself with sighs which God also hears; a righteous judge, on the contrary, will surely enjoy at the same time the blessing and the intercession of the pious.—WOHLFARTH: The blessing of a wise severity in the State (in the administration of the laws).

Vers. 26-29. GEIER (on ver. 26): If thou meanest to deal fairly with thine own soul, then rejoice heartily in good counsel given from the word of God; though it be disagreeable to the flesh, yet it is like a precious balsam (Ps. cxli. 5).—STARKE (on ver. 27): He who with all his carefulness in attention to his occupation yet forgets the one thing needful, builds his house

Digitized by Google

on the sand, because in the midst of all outward prosperity he still suffers injury in his soul.—(On ver. 29): If thou wouldst be really like God as His child, then follow Him in compassion and leave the right of vengeance to Him alone: Lev. xix. 18; Rom. xii. 17 sq.

Vers. 30-34. STARKE: Indolence is extremely injurious to the Christian life. If one does not do good with earnestness and diligence, evil surely gains more and more the ascendency, and in all conditions, in Church and State and in domestic life, want and labor are multiplied as the result of neglect of official duty on the part of the servants and stewards instituted by God.—WOHLFARTH (on ver. 32): To become wise on the follies of others is in fact an excellent prudence.—[ARNOT: Even the sluggard's garden brought forth fruit—but not for the sluggard's benefit. The diligent man reaped and carried off the only harvest that it bore—a warning.—J. FOSTER; Lecture on Practical Views of Human Life. Let it never be forgotten in any part of the process that the efficacy of the instruction must be from the Supreme Teacher; without Him, the attraction and assimilation of the evil would, after all, be mightier than its warning and repelling force].

IV. LATER COLLECTION BY THE MEN OF HEZEKIAH.

True wisdom proclaimed as the chief good to kings and their subjects.

CHAPS. XXV.—XXIX.

SUPERSCRIPTION: CHAP. XXV. 1.

1 These also are proverbs of Solomon
which men of Hezekiah, the king of Judah, collected.

1. Admonition to the fear of God and righteousness, addressed to kings and subjects.

CHAP. XXV. 2-28

2 It is the glory of God to conceal a thing;
but the glory of kings to search out a matter.
3 The heavens for height, and the earth for depth,
and the heart of kings (are) unsearchable.
4 Take away the dross from silver,
and there cometh forth a vessel for the refiner;
5 take away the wicked from before the king,
and his throne shall be established in righteousness.
6 Display not thyself in the presence of the king,
and stand not in the place of the great;
7 for it is better that it be said to thee, "Come up hither,"
than that they humble thee because of the king,
whom thine eyes have seen.
8 Go not forth hastily to strive,
lest (it be said to thee): "What wilt thou do in the end,
when thy neighbor hath put thee to shame?"
9 Debate thy cause with thy neighbor,
but disclose not the secret of another;
10 lest he that heareth it upbraid thee,
and thine infamy turn not away.
11 (Like) apples of gold in framework of silver
is a word fitly spoken.
12 (As) a gold ring and an ornament of fine gold
is a wise reprover to an ear that heareth.

Digitized by Google

13 As the coolness of snow on a harvest day
is a faithful messenger to them that send him;
he refresheth the soul of his master.
14 Clouds and wind and no rain—
(so is) a man who boasteth of a false gift.
15 By forbearance is a prince persuaded,
and a gentle tongue breaketh the bone.
16 Hast thou found honey—eat to thy satisfaction,
lest thou be surfeited with it and vomit it.
17 Withhold thy foot from thy neighbor's house,
lest he be weary of thee and hate thee.
18 A maul, and a sword, and a sharp arrow
is the man that speaketh as a false witness against his neighbor.
19 (Like) a broken tooth and an unsteady foot
is confidence in an unfaithful man in the day of need.
20 (As) he that layeth aside clothing in a cold day—(as) vinegar on nitre—
is he that singeth songs with a heavy heart.
21 If thine enemy hunger, give him bread to eat,
and if he thirst, give him water to drink:
22 for (so) dost thou heap burning coals on his head;
and Jehovah will reward thee.
23 North wind produceth rain,
so doth the slanderous tongue a troubled face.
24 It is better to dwell in a corner of the house top,
than with a quarrelsome woman in a wide house.
25 As cold water to a thirsty soul,
so is good news from a far country.
26 (Like) a troubled fountain and a ruined spring
is the righteous man who wavereth before the wicked.
27 To eat much honey is not good,
and to search out the difficult bringeth difficulty.
28 (As) a city broken through, without walls,
is the man who hath no mastery over his own spirit.

GRAMMATICAL AND CRITICAL.

[In the section of the Book of Proverbs including chaps. xxv.—xxix. peculiar idioms are more numerous, peculiarities in radical forms and in inflections, some of them common to this section with some others in the Old Testament, others of an Aramaic type. These have usually been regarded (if explained at all) as resulting from the more miscellaneous character of this portion of the collection. Bött. finds here provincialisms characteristic of Ephraim, belonging more naturally to the section of the country most in contact with Syria. The correctness of this view needs to be established by close investigation. For the enumeration of particulars see Böttcher's *Ausfuhrliches Lehrbuch*, §§ 29, 34, 35.—A.]

Ver. 4.—The Infin. abs. הָגוֹ [old root הגה, see also Green, § 172, 2, for the peculiar form] is in both cases, in vers. 4 and 5, to be regarded as Imperative (so all the ancient versions, and also Umbreit, Ewald, Elster), and not as in the first instance a substitute for the Indic. Imperf. (Hitzig, Bertheau), or as standing in both cases for the gerund (so Stier: is to be, should be taken away, *etc.*). [In ver. 4 this virtual Imper. is followed by a *consec. Imperf.*, in ver. 5 by a *consec. Jussive*: "let his throne be established." *etc.* Bött., § 980, *B*, and n. 10.—A.]

Ver. 7.—[אֲמָר, an impersonal use of the Kal. Inf. constr., "good is the saying;" the rendering is often appropriately passive,—so here "that it be said to thee." Here and in ver. 27 the Infin. has a masc. predicate; in ver. 24 the fem. Infin. שֶׁבֶת takes the same. Bött., § 990, 1, *a*, and 3 β.—A.]

Ver. 9.—[הָגֵל. a Piel Imperf. *apocopate* with lengthened vowel. See Green, § 174, 4; Nordh., § 451; Bött., § 1085, *A.*, *etc.*—A.]

Ver. 11.—[דָּבֻר, either a Kal Pass. Partic., written defectively,—or a Hoph. Partic. deprived of its initial מ, which is no uncommon loss: the form would then be דָּבָר; see Bött., § 994, 5, 6, 10.—אָפְנָיו, regarded by Bött. as well as by Z. and others as derived from אֹפֶן, *wheel*, the form is dual, the plural form with the same suffix being אֹפַנָּיו; the meaning will then be "on its (pair of) wheels," readily, aptly. See Bött., §§ 678, 3, *f.*; 685, 42, and n. 4. Fuerst gives the preference to another meaning supported from the Arabic and the Talm., "*nach seinen Arten*," according to its various uses and applications—fitly.—A.]

Ver. 16.—[הֲקֵאתוֹ, a Perf. Hiph. with peculiarities in the vocalization and the suffix. Bött., §§ 1158, 2; 1188, 83.—A.]

Ver. 17.—הֹקַר, Imper. Hiph. from יָקַר (Is. xiii. 12; 1 Sam. iii. 1).

Vers. 19.—רֹעָה, Partic. fem. Kal from רעע=רצץ. [Explained by Gesen. as an Infin. fem. used substantively, but by Fuerst, Bött., *etc.*, as by our author,—a fem. part. passing into an adjective use.] Instead of מוּעָדֶת, wavering, unsteady, is either to be read מוֹעֶדֶת (Part. Kal from מעד), or the form is with R. Kimchi, Bertheau, Elster, *etc.*, to be re-

Digitized by Google

garded as a Pual part. with the omission of the performative מ (comp. Is. liv. 11, *etc.*); comp. EWALD, *Lehrb.*, 169 *d.* [FUERST supports the latter explanation; GESEN., *Lex.* and *Lehrgeb.*, BÖTT., GREEN (?) and others adopt the author's view. See esp. BÖTT., §§ 492, ז and n. 2; 1068, *C* and n. 4.—A.]

Ver. 20.—מַעֲדֶה is usually taken as a Hiph. Part. from עָדָה, "he who taketh off clothing," *etc.* FUERST suggests the construing and rendering of it as a noun, with the meaning *Pracht*, splendor; BÖTT. strenuously maintains that it can be nothing else. *Lehr.*, II., p. 377, n. 1, and references there given.—A.]

EXEGETICAL.

1. Vers. 1. *The Superscription*—plainly belonging to the whole subsequent collection as far as the end of chap. xxix., and not merely to some such portion as xxv. 2—xxvii. 27, as HITZIG suggests; for there is in chap. xxviii. 1 no new superscription, and the assumption that in chap. xxviii. 17 sq. the central main division of the entire Book of Proverbs (xii.—xxii. 16) is continued, while xxviii. 1–16 is a fragment from a later hand, lacks all real support. Comp. remarks above on chap. xxii. 1.—**These also are proverbs of Solomon**—whether precisely in the strictest sense, or in the broader one of an authorship that is Solomon's only indirectly, on this point the expression gives us no definite knowledge. Proverbs of Solomon in the broader sense may very properly be included under the phrase.—**Which have been collected.**—In regard to the meaning of this verb see what is already said in the Introd., § 12 (pp. 26). The meaning "remove" (from the original place), "transfer, transplant, compile" is certainly lexically established, and is to be preferred without qualification to the explanations which differ from it; to "append" or "arrange" (*ordine disponere*), or to "preserve" (*durare facere, conservare*). Whether as the source from which the transfer or compilation of the following proverbs was made, we are to think simply of one book or of several books, so that the transfer would be the purely literary labor of excerpting, a transcribing, or collecting by copying (comp. the ἃς ἐξεγράψαντο of the LXX); or whether we have to consider as the source simply the oral transmission of ancient proverbs of wise men by the mouth of the people (HITZIG), must remain doubtful. It is perhaps most probable, that both the written and the oral tradition were alike sifted for the objects of the collection.—**By the men of Hezekiah.**—Possibly a learned commission created by this king for the purpose of this work of compilation, consisting of the most noted "wise men" of his time. Comp. Introd., § 3, and § 12, as cited above. [FUERST, in his *Kanon des Alten Testaments*, cites the Jewish tradition as holding a different view in several of these particulars. In regard to original authorship, the title is not interpreted as even claiming all for Solomon, though his is the chief and representative name; it is rather the aim and effect of the collection that is emphasized. Tradition, moreover, interprets the "these also" as showing that the preceding sections were likewise collected by the men of Hezekiah, the verb הֶעְתִּיקוּ in the superscription to this fourth collection meaning "continued." "The men of Hezekiah" furthermore are represented as not simply literati and poets of the king's court temporarily associated, and engaged in a specific work, but a "college" existing for similar purposes two hundred and eighty years, seven full generations. For details and references see FUERST's *Kanon*, pp. 73–80.—A.]

2. Vers. 2–5. Of kings, their necessary attributes and duties.—**It is the glory of God to conceal a thing**—*viz.*, so far forth as He, the "God that hideth Himself" (Is. xlv. 15), is incomprehensible in His being, and "unsearchable in His judgments" (Rom. xi. 33), so that accordingly all His action is a working out from the unknown, the hidden, a sudden revealing of hidden marvels (the "secret things" of Deut. xxix. 29). ["David says, 'The heavens *declare* the glory of *God*,' and Solomon adds, that God's glory is seen not only in what He reveals, but what He conceals—a profound observation, which is the best answer to many Scriptural objections to Divine Revelation, as has been shown by BP. BUTLER in his *Analogy*." WORDSW., *in loc.*].—On the contrary, it is **the glory of kings to search out a matter**, rightly to discern and to make clear debatable points in jurisprudence, and in general, on the ground of careful inquiry, investigation and consultation, to issue commands and to shape political ordinances. Comp. what GÖTHE once said (*Sammtl. Werke*, Bd. XLV., p. 41): "It is the business of the world-spirit to preserve mysteries before, yea, often after the deed; the poet's impulse is to disclose the mystery;" and also LUTHER's marginal comment on our passage (see, below, the Homiletical notes).—דָּבָר is moreover in both instances to be rendered by "thing, matter," and not by "word" (Vulg., COCCEIUS, UMBREIT, *etc*); for in clause *b* in particular this latter meaning seems wholly inapposite.

Ver. 3. **The heavens for height, the earth for depth, and the heart of kings** (are) **unsearchable.**—אֵין חֵקֶר, "no searching out," is plainly the predicate of the subjects in clause *a* also, so that the entire verse forms but one proposition. And this is not a possible admonition to kings (not to suffer themselves to be searched out, but to preserve their secrets faithfully), as UMBREIT, VAN ESS, DE W., *etc.*, think, but a simple didactic proposition, to bring out the fact, that while the heart of man is in general deep and difficult to fathom (Jer. xvii. 9; Ps. lxiv. 7), that of kings is peculiarly inaccessible and shut up within itself, much as may be depending on its decisions. [While, then, according to ver. 2, "it is a king's glory to get all the light he can" (STUART), it is his glory, and often an absolute condition of his prosperity and that of his kingdom, that he be able to keep his own counsel,—that of his heart there be "no searching out." —A.]

Vers. 4, 5. **Take away the dross from silver.**—The "dross," whose removal empowers the "refiner" or goldsmith to prepare a vase of noble metals, corresponds here, as in Jeremiah vi. 29, to the wicked or ungodly men who are to be purged out of a political commonwealth.—**Take away the wicked from before the king—**

Digitized by Google

i. e., before the court or by virtue of the king's judicial decision. The wicked is probably not to be designated as a "servant of the king" by the phrase "before the king" (contrary to the view of EWALD and BERTHEAU [KAMPH., DÖDERLEIN, H., *etc.*]).—With 5, *b*, comp. xvi. 12; xxix. 14.

3. Vers. 6, 7. Warning against arrogance in intercourse with kings and their nobles.—**Display not thyself in the presence of the king**;—lit., "bring not thy glory to view, make not thyself glorious" (STIER).—With the phrase "great men" in clause *b* comp. xviii. 6; 2 Sam. iii. 38; 2 Kings x. 6, *etc.*—With ver. 7 compare in general Luke xiv. 8–11, as well as the Arabic proverb (MEIDANI, p. 72), "Sit not in a place from which one may bid thee rise up."—**Than that they humble thee** (thy humbling) **before the king.**—Z. renders "because of a prince," and goes on to say: "Usually, 'before a prince, in his presence.' But then we should have expected rather the plural, 'before, in the presence of princes and nobles.' לִפְנֵי seems to require to be employed here rather in the sense of 'because of, in relation to' (comp. 2 Sam. iii. 31); and the following 'whom thine eyes have seen' seems to suggest the criminality, by no means ignorant, of the dishonor put on the dignity of the prince (thus HITZIG correctly explains)." [We cannot see the fitness of this departure from universal usage in regard to לִפְנֵי, which occurs hundreds of times in the O. T. with various modifications of the meaning "before," but has not in one conceded instance the meaning "on account of." It has been used twice just before with its ordinary meaning, and before the end of the chapter occurs again with the same meaning. There is room for difference of opinion as to the person *before whom* the humiliation is to be,—whether it be the king himself, or some prince or noble of his court, but there can be none as to the preposition required to express the idea. It is probably best to regard the king, who is chiefly affronted by such arrogance, as described here, not by his specific and official title, but as the *exalted* one who was to see and be seen, and before whom the humiliation is most crushing.—A.]

4. Vers. 8–10. Warning against contentiousness and loquacity.—**Go not forth hastily to strive**;—*i. e.*, do not begin controversies with undue haste (LUTHER: rush not forth soon to quarrel).—**Lest** (it be said to thee) "**What wilt thou do in the end**," *etc.*—Lit., "at the end thereof, at its (the strife's) end," at the time, therefore, when the evil results of the contention have shown themselves. It is so natural to supply a verb of saying with the "lest" before "What wilt thou do?" that we may without hesitation have recourse to this expedient for filling out the form of expression, which certainly is perplexingly concise and elliptical (comp. UMBREIT, ELSTER, STIER [KAMPH., H., N., M.], *etc.*, and even a commentator as early as JARCHI, on this passage). At all events this solution is better than that devised by EWALD and BERTHEAU [DE W., S.], who take the "what" in the sense of "what evil, what terrible thing" ("lest disgracefully treated by thine opponent and excited to wrath, thou do some fearful thing!")

Ver. 9. **Debate thy cause** (strive thy strife) **with thy neighbor**, *etc.*—If the contest has become really inevitable, if it has come to process of law, then press thy cause with energy, but honorably, with the avoidance of all unworthy or low means,—and especially in such a way that thou do not by any possibility with a malicious wickedness betray secrets of thine opponent that may have been earlier entrusted to thee.

Ver. 10. **Lest he that heareth it upbraid thee.**—The "hearer" does not denote possibly the injured friend (LXX, SCHULTENS [WORDSW.], *etc.*)—which would be intolerably flat and tautological, but very indefinitely, any one who obtains knowledge of that dishonorable and treacherous conduct. The Piel חִסֵּד is used here only in the sense of "curse, despise;" comp. the corresponding noun "reproach" in chap. xiv. 34.—**And thine evil name turn not away,**—die not out again, depart not from thee. Comp. the use of שׁוּב of wrath that is allayed or quieted; Gen. xxvii. 44, 45, and frequently.

5. Vers. 11–15. Five symmetrically constructed and concise comparisons, in praise of wisdom in speech, of fidelity, liberality and gentleness.—Ver. 11. **Apples of gold in framework of silver.** מַשְׂכִּית which occurred in chap. xviii. 11, in the sense of "imagination, conceit," is unquestionably to be left with its usual meaning, "sculpture" (carved or embossed work); comp. Ezek. viii. 12; Lev. xxvi. 1; Num. xxxiii. 52. Under the term we are to understand some such thing as sculptured work for the decoration of ceilings, pillared galleries, *etc.*, which exhibits golden apples on a groundwork of silver. That in this case we must have expected the precise term for "pomegranates" (רִמּוֹנִים) is an arbitrary assertion of HITZIG's, in support of which we need neither emend with him, to read בְּמַשְׂכְּלוֹת (from an alleged noun אֶשְׁכּוֹל—מַשְׂכֶּלֶת, palm bough) "or branches," nor with LUTHER give to the word in question the signification "baskets," which has no parallel to support it. [KAMPH., H., M., *etc.*, support this rendering of LUTHER's; DE W. and N. suppose the silver work to be inlaid or embossed on the golden apples; while BERTHEAU, GESEN., S., WORDSW., *etc.*, understand the description to be of golden fruit, represented either in solid or embroidered work on a ground-work of silver. FUERST seems to favor the application of the term to ornamented furniture or plate for the table; and this certainly has the advantage of natural probability in its favor—A.]—(Is) **a word fitly spoken** ["spoken in its time."—Z.] Comp. xv. 23, where however we have בְּעִתּוֹ instead of the unique expression found in our verse. That this peculiar form of speech, which appears to signify strictly "after the manner of its wheels, or on its wheels," is in reality equivalent to *justo tempore, in tempore suo*, is expressed as early as SYMMACHUS and the Vulg., as well as supported by the analogy of a similar Arabic expression, in which the radical word אוֹפֶן is in like manner used to describe time revolving in its circuit, moving on in the form of a ring, or after the

Digitized by Google

manner of wheels. Comp. also the well known vision of Ezekiel; Ezek. i. 15 sq. [See Crit. Notes. BERTHEAU, H., favor the exposition above given; GESEN., S., M., WORDSW. favor the other and less figurative way of reaching the same idea.—A.]

Ver. 12. **A gold ring and an ornament of fine gold.** נֶזֶם, elsewhere a ring for the nose (xi. 22, *etc.*), is here, as clause *b* shows, rather an ear-ring or ear-drop (comp. Gen. xxxv. 4). חֲלִי is in general a pendant, a jewel, such as is usually worn on the neck or in the ears, (Song Sol. vii. 2; Hos. ii. 15); and is here naturally used in the latter sense, therefore possibly of the ornament of pearls which was hung below the ear-ring.—(So is) **a wise reprover to an ear that heareth.** "The reprover, or punisher," is a concrete, lively, illustrative expression instead of "rebuke or censure." The boldness of the expression still fails to justify HITZIG's attempted emendation, according to which כִּיחַ is to be read instead of מוֹכִיחַ, and this is to be taken in the sense of "conversation" ("rational conversation"—comp. the λόγος σοφός of the LXX). With the general sentiment comp. besides chap. xv. 31, 32.

Ver. 13. **As the coolness of snow on a harvest day,** *i. e.* probably, as a refreshing drink cooled by the snow of Lebanon amidst the heats of harvest labor. Comp. XENOPH. *Memorab.* II. 1, 30; PLIN. *Hist Nat.*, XIX. 4; and especially the passages cited by HITZIG from the "*Gesta Dei per Francos*" (Han. 1611), p. 1098: "The coldest snow is brought from Lebanon, to be mixed with wine, and make it cold as the very ice." [See HACKETT's *Illustrations of Scripture*, pp. 53–5, for illustrations of the usage, and statements in regard to the extent of the traffic. —A.] With clauses *b* and *c* comp. x. 26; xiii. 17; xxii. 21.

Ver. 14. **Clouds and wind and no rain—** (so is) **a man who boasteth of a false gift.** That is, a boaster who makes much talk of his liberality, and yet withal gives nothing (who "promises mountains of gold, but does not even give lead," (STIER), is like clouds of vapor borne aloft and driven about by the wind (נְשִׂיאִים, lit, light rising vapors, which gather in clouds), which dispense no rain. The same figure, with a similar application: Jude 12; 2 Pet. ii. 17; likewise in several Arabic proverbs, *e. g. Exc. ex Sent.* 48 (ed. SCHEID.): "A learned man without work, is as a cloud without rain."

Ver. 14. To the recommendation of liberality in the verses preceding there is very appropriately added an admonition to gentleness and mildness, especially in the use of the tongue. Comp. xv. 1.—**By forbearance is a judge persuaded,** lit., "talked over, misled," *i. e*, changed in his disposition, influenced, comp. Luke xviii. 4, 5. קָצִין here certainly means "judge," as in vi. 7, and not "King, prince," as some of the older expositors, and LUTHER also, render it, and as UMBREIT is inclined to regard it. [Why not the "prince," acting in his judicial capacity, and in other relations also where the bearing and spirit of those about him will more or less consciously mould his action? He is the "decider" in more ways than one.—A.] **And a gentle tongue breaketh the bone,** *i. e.*, subdues even the most obstinate resistance. Comp. the Latin: "*Gutta cavat lapidem*," *etc.*, as well as the German, "Patience breaks iron."

6. Vers. 16–20. Warning against intemperance, obtrusiveness, slander, credulity and levity.—**Hast thou found honey—eat to thy satisfaction** (lit., "thy enough"). Comp. Samson and Jonathan as finders of honey (Judges xiv. 8 sq.; 1 Sam. xiv. 26), and also a warning against partaking of it to excess, ver. 27, and PINDAR, *Nem.* 7, 52: Κόρον ἔχει καὶ μέλι.

Ver. 17 first introduces the real application of this warning against eating honey in excess. **Withhold thy foot from thy friend's house.** "Make rare, keep back, seldom enter with it," *etc.* Comp. the σπάνιον εἴσαγε τὸν πόδα of the LXX.—Comp. besides the similar proverbs of the Arabs, which warn against obtrusiveness: "If thy comrade eats honey do not lick it all up," or "Visit seldom, and they love thee the more," *etc.* Also MARTIAL's sentiment: *Nulli te facias nimis amicum.*

Ver. 18. **A maul and a sword and a sharp arrow.** מֵפִיץ an instrument for crushing, a club shod with iron, a war-club (Nah. ii. 2; comp. the cognate terms in Jer. li. 20, and Ezek. ix. 2). For additional comparisons of false, malicious words with swords and arrows, comp. Ps. lii. 4; lvii. 5; lxiv. 4; cxx. 4, *etc.* See also the previous rebukes of false testimony; Prov. vi. 19; xii. 17; xix. 5, 9; xxi. 28.

Ver. 19. **A broken tooth and an unsteady foot** (is) **confidence in an unfaithful man,** *etc.* שֵׁן רֹעָה is to be explained either by a substantive construction, "tooth of breaking" (UMBREIT, STIER following ABEN EZRA), or by a participial construction, "a breaking tooth." The latter is to be preferred as the simpler (BERTHEAU, ELSTER, *etc.*, [See Crit. Notes]); to change the punctuation so as to get the meaning, "a bad, worthless tooth," HITZIG, is at any rate unnecessary, since the meaning "decayed, rotten," is in general not questionable. "Trust in (lit., of) an unfaithful man" is here a foolish, credulous reliance on one who is false. For the figure comp. furthermore, especially Is. xxxvi. 6; 1 Kings xviii. 21.

Ver. 20. **He that layeth aside clothing in a cold day.** This is plainly a senseless proceeding, an entirely aimless and absurd movement. The same is true of the action suggested by the words following, "vinegar on nitre;" for the moistening of nitre (comp. Jer. ii. 22), *i. e.*, doubtless carbonate of soda, or soda, with vinegar or acid destroys its substance, while to combine the same thing with oil, *etc.*, produces a useful soap. Thus, and doubtless correctly, ROSENM., BERTHEAU, VON GERLACH, and substantially UMBREIT also (although he thinks rather of potash or saltpetre as the substance here designated). J. D. MICHAELIS (*de nitro Hebræorum*), J. F. VON MEYER, STIER, *etc.*, think specially of the fermentation and the offensive odor which the nitre produces in contact with vinegar(?). SCHULTENS, EWALD and ELSTER understand נֶתֶר in accordance with the Arabic (and also in harmony with the ἕλκει of the LXX),

Digitized by Google

of a *wound*, which is washed with smarting vinegar instead of soothing oil; against this view, however, we have of the other ancient versions except the LXX, especially the Vulg., SYMMACHUS, the Vers. Venet., *etc.* HITZIG finally emends here again according to his fancy, and obtains the meaning: "He that meeteth archers, with arrow on the string, is like him who singeth songs with a sad heart"(!)—[GESEN., FUERST and the lexicographers generally refer to descriptions of Egypt and its natural productions, in describing the material and its properties. H., N., M., WORDSW., *etc.*, take the same view, and multiply and vary the references. See THOMSON's *Land and Book*, II. 302, 303. WORDSW. expresses a decided preference for the rendering of clause *a*, which (see Crit. Notes) is preferred by FUERST, BÖTT., *etc.*, "display in dress" instead of comfort; "as he that tricks out a man in a gay dress in winter, he who busies himself about the fineness and brilliancy instead of the texture and warmth of the attire," *etc.* This certainly secures a better correspondence of incongruities.—A.] Moreover, the "singing songs with a heavy heart" (for these last words comp. the similar phrases in Gen. xl. 7; Neh. ii. 1, 2; Eccles. vii. 3), which is described by the two comparisons in clause *a*, as a senseless and perverse proceeding, is doubtless to be understood in the sense of Ps. cxxxvii. 1, 4, and not to be taken as possibly a disregard of the Apostolic injunction in Rom. xii. 15. For the heart is hardly that of another [E. V., DE W., H., N., S., M., WORDSW.; "*to* a heavy heart"], but most probably the speaker's own heart. The procedure against which the sentiment of the verse is directed seems therefore to be frivolity, and superficial, insincere conduct, and not a rude indifference and uncharitableness toward one's neighbor.

7. Vers. 21, 22. Admonition to the love of enemies.—**If thine enemy** (lit., "thine hater") **hunger, give him bread to eat,** *etc.* "Bread" and "water" are named here as the simplest and readiest refreshment. To name meat, wine, dainties and the like would have been quite too forced. In the citation in the N. T., in Rom. xii. 20, both objects are for brevity omitted and thereby the expression is made more like Matt. xxv. 35.—**For so thou dost heap burning coals on his head.** For this verb to heap, to pile up, comp. vi. 27. To "heap coals on the head of any one" cannot be the figurative representation of a burning shame which one develops in his opponent (GRAMBERG, UMBREIT), for shame glows in the cheek, and not above on the head. The figure is designed to describe rather the deep pangs of repentance which one produces within his enemy by rewarding his hatred with benefits, and in the production of which the revenge to be taken on him may consist, simply and solely. This correct view is first presented by AUGUSTINE, *De doctr. Christ.*, III. 16; and then especially by SCHULTENS, ROSENM., HITZIG, *etc.* These last at the same time adduce pertinent Arabic parallels, like MEIDANI, II. 721: "He who kindly treats such as envy him, scatters glowing coals in their face, *etc.* At all events, we must decidedly reject the interpretation of many of the Church Fathers, like CHRYSOSTOM, THEODORET, THEOPHYLACT, *etc.*, who regarded the coals as the designation of extreme divine judgments (comp. Ps. xi. 6; cxl. 11) which one will bring upon his enemy by refusing to avenge himself. [In this last opinion our recent commentators, perhaps without exception, agree with the author. In regard to his first discrimination, if any have been inclined to limit the figure to the superficial blush or the transient emotion of shame, there would be a general agreement with him. If he means to discriminate sharply between shame and repentance, we must pronounce his distinctions too fine, as some will be inclined to regard his comment on the proper seat of the blush. A deep, true shame, may be the first step toward, the first element in repentance.—A.]

8. Vers. 23-28. Against slander, a contentious spirit, timidity, want of self-control, *etc.* **North wind produceth rain.** For the verb comp. Ps. xc. 2; for a description of the rainy wind of Palestine, which strictly blows, not from the North, but from the North-west and West, as רוּחַ צָפוֹן, comp. Am. viii. 12, where this "North" is contrasted with מִזְרָח "the East." Perhaps this term is equivalent to ζόφος as a designation of a dark, gloomy region, which we are by no means to seek directly north of Palestine (UMBREIT; comp. HITZIG). In no case is JEROME right (and ABEN EZRA), when in view of the predominantly dry, cold and rough character of the north of Palestine, he renders the verb by "*dissipat pluvias*, it scatters the clouds, and so ends the rain." [The author's view is that of DE W., KAMPH., BERTHEAU, MUFFET, H., N., S., M., WORDSW., GESEN., and the recent commentators and lexicographers almost without exception. Now and then JEROME's rendering, which is that of the E. V., is assumed to be right, and illustrated, as *e. g.* in THOMSON's *Land and Book* I. 131.—A.]—**So doth the slanderous tongue a troubled face** [lit., "a secret tongue"]; *i. e.*, artful calumny and slander (comp. Ps. ci. 5) produces gloomy, troubled faces, just as surely as the North-west wind darkens the heavens with rain-clouds. The *tertium compar.* in the figure is therefore the same as in Matt. xvi. 3; Luke xii. 54. Comp. besides the German proverb, "He makes a face like a three days' rain-storm." [Those who follow the E. V. in the rendering of the first clause, must with it invert subject and object in clause *b*, and change the epithet, "troubled," dark with sadness, for "angry," dark with passion; "so doth an angry countenance a backbiting tongue." TRAPP, *e. g.*, says: "The ready way to be rid of tale-bearers is to browbeat them; carry therefore in this case a severe rebuke in thy countenance, as God doth."—A.]

Ver. 24. Comp. the literally identical sentence, chap. xxi. 9.

Ver. 25. **(As) cold water to a thirsty soul is good news from a far country.** Naturally we must here think of those far removed from their home and kindred, who have long remained without tidings from them. Comp. xv. 30; Gen. xlv. 27; and for the figure, Jer. xviii. 14.

Digitized by Google

Ver. 26. **A troubled fountain and a ruined spring** (comp. for this figure Ezek. xxxii. 2; xxxiv. 18, 19) **is the righteous man who wavereth before the wicked.** The meaning of this is probab y not the righteous man who *without fault of his* has been brought by evil doers into calamity, but he who through the fault of his timidity, his want of faithful courage and moral firmness, has been brought to waver and fall by the craft of the wicked. Compare STIER on this passage, who however understands the wavering perhaps too exclusively of being betrayed into sin, or some moral lapse. [LORD BACON (*De Augmentis, etc.*) gives the proverb a political application: "This proverb teaches that an unjust and scandalous judgment in any conspicuous and weighty cause is above all things to be avoided in the State," *etc.*; and in his Essay (LVI.) "of Judicature," he says: "One foul sentence doth more hurt than many foul examples; for these do but corrupt the stream, the other corrupteth the fountain."—A.]

Ver. 27. **To eat much honey is not good.** Since this maxim, like the similar one in verse 16, must convey a warning against the excessive enjoyment of a thing good in itself, we should look in the 2d clause for an analogous truth belonging to the spiritual realm. That clause is therefore not to be rendered: "And contempt of their honor is honor" (thus J. D. MICHAELIS, ARNOLDI, ZIEGLER, EWALD,—all of whom take חֵקֶר in the sense of "contempt" (comp. xxviii. 11); and HITZIG likewise, except that he [by a transfer of one consonant] reads כָּבוֹד מִכָּבוֹד, and "contempt of honor is more than honor"). But we must here reclaim for the noun כָּבוֹד its original meaning "weight, burden," instead of כְּבוֹדָם we must read כְּבוּדִים, "weighty things, difficulties," and then retaining the ordinary meaning of חֵקֶר we must render: "and searching out the difficult brings difficulty," *i. e.*, too strenuous occupation of mind with difficult things is injurious; pondering too difficult problems brings injury (comp. the common proverb, "To know everything makes headache"). So ELSTER alone [with NOYES among our expositors, and FUERST, substantially, of the lexicographers] correctly explains,—while UMBREIT and BERTHEAU [with whom S. and M. agree] take only the last כָּבוֹד in the sense of difficulty, and therefore explain "and searching out honor (or "their honor") brings difficulty;" in a similar way the Vulgate "*qui scrutator est majestatis opprimetur a gloria*" ["he who is a searcher after dignity will be crushed by glory." The E. V. renders "to search their own glory (is not) glory;" the assumed meaning of the noun demands a negative copula, such as has just been used in clause *a*; so GESEN.(?) KAMPH. enumerates the above and several other renderings, and pronounces all unsatisfactory. HOLDEN and WORDSW. retain the ordinary meaning of all the nouns, supply the usual copula, and render: "To search after their glory (their *true* glory) is glory." The sentiment is fine, but to attach it to clause *a* requires skill.]

Ver. 28. (As) **a city broken through without walls** (comp. 2 Chron. xxxii. 5; Nehem. ii. 13), **is the man who hath no mastery over his own spirit,** *i. e.*, the passionate man, who knows not how in anything to keep within bounds, who can put bit and bridle on none of his desires, and therefore is given up without resistance to all impressions from without, to all assaults upon his morality and freedom, *etc.* Let it be observed how nearly this proverb corresponds with the substance of the preceding.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

In the noble admonition to the love of enemies, in vers. 21, 22, which bears witness for the New Testament principle of a perfect love even more definitely and in fuller measure, than the dissuasion contained in the preceding chapter against avenging one's self (xxiv. 29), we reach the culmination of those moral demands and precepts with which the wise compiler of the Proverbs comes in the present section before the kings and subjects of his people. Beside this, in the exceedingly rich and manifold variety of ethical material which this chapter exhibits, the admonitions that stand out significantly are especially those to humility and modesty (vers. 6, 7, 14), to a peaceable spirit (vers. 8, 24) to honor and considerate forbearance toward one's opponent in controversy (ver. 9, 10, 23), to the wise reception of merited reproof and correction (ver. 12), to gentleness (ver. 15), to fidelity and sincerity (vers. 13, 18-20), to moderation in all things, in enjoyments of a sensual as well as of a spiritual kind (vers. 16, 17, 27), to moral firmness in resisting the seductive influences of the wicked, and in subduing the passions (vers. 26, 28). In regard to doctrine it is especially the delineation contained in vers. 2-5, of the godlike dignity and authority of the King, that is to be accounted one of the pre-eminently instructive portions of the chapter. The earthly king is, it is true, in this unlike to God, the King of kings, that he can take his decisive steps only after careful consideration, examination, and conference with wise counsellors, and only thus issue his commands, so far forth as they are to result in the welfare of his subjects,—while with God, the being who is alike near and afar off, the all-wise and Almighty, counsel and act are always coincident. But in this again there can and should be an analogy existing between earthly rulers and the heavenly King, that their throne also is established by righteousness, that they likewise must watch with unfaltering strictness, by punishing the evil and rewarding the good, over the sacred ordinance of justice and the objective moral law (vers. 4, 5). And for this very reason there belongs to their action also something mysterious and absolutely irresistible; their heart too appears unsearchable, and wholly inaccessible to common men, like the heights of heaven and the depths of the earth (ver. 3); in a word, they in the political sphere stand in every point of view as God's representatives, as regents in God's stead and by the grace of God, and even, according to the bold expression of the poetical language of the Old Testament, as in a certain sense even "gods and

Digitized by Google

children of the Most High" (Ps. lxxxii. 6; comp. John x. 34 sq.). From this then there results, on the one hand, to themselves the duty of strict justice, and the most conscientious conformity to God's holy will,—but on the other, for their subjects the duties of humble obedience (vers. 6, 7, 13) of earnest reverence for civil laws and ordinances, and peaceable deportment, (vers. 8-10, 18, 23, 24, *etc.*); in general therefore, the *fear of God* and *righteousness*, as the conditions of a true welfare of earth's nobles and nations, to be fulfilled on both parts, by princes as well as by the people.

HOMILETIC AND PRACTICAL.

Homily on the entire chapter: "Love the brethren; fear God; honor the King!" (2 Pet. ii. 17); three apostolical injunctions, which Hezekiah's wise men already preached to the Israel of their day.—Or, the fear of God, justice and love, as the three foundation pillars of a well-founded and well organized Christian commonwealth.—Comp. STÖCKER; Of true honor, such as wisdom confers: 1) in the state (ver. 2-15: *gloria politicorum*); 2) in the household (vers. 16-24: *gloria œconomicorum*); 3) in the church (vers. 25-28: *gloria ecclesiasticorum*).—*Berleburg Bible:* Divine political maxims.—WOHLFARTH: Honor and renown as wisdom's reward.

Vers. 2-5. LUTHER (marginal comment on ver. 2): In God's government we are not to be wise, and wish to know why, but believe everything. But in the secular kingdom a ruler should know, and ask why, and trust no man in anything!—STARKE: God's counsel concerning our blessedness is revealed to us clearly enough in His word; act accordingly, and in the presence of the mysteries of divine wisdom take thy reason captive under the obedience of faith.—[JEREMY TAYLOR: God's commandments were proclaimed to all the world; but God's counsels are to Himself and to His secret ones, when they are admitted within the veil.—BATES: God saveth us by the submission of faith and not by the penetration of reason. The light of faith is as much below the light of glory as it is above the light of nature.—R. Hall's Sermon on "the glory of God in concealing." 1) The Divine Being is accustomed to conceal much. 2) In this He acts in a manner worthy of Himself, and suited to display His glory.—LORD BACON (on ver. 3); Multitude of jealousies, and lack of some predominant desire, that should marshal and put in order all the rest, maketh any man's heart hard to find or sound].—GEIER (on ver. 3): Every one, even the greatest and mightiest, is to know that God knows his heart most perfectly and searches it through: Ps. cxxxix. 1, 2.—CRAMER (on vers. 4, 5): As well in matters of religion as in matters of justice (in the sphere of the church and in politics) the duty belongs to the ruler of removing all abuses and offences.

Vers. 6 sq. GEIER (on ver. 6): An excellent means against pride consists in looking to those who are better, more pious, more experienced, more learned than we are, rather than to estimate ourselves solely by those who are lower.—STARKE (on vers. 9, 10): If thou hast a reasonable complaint against thy neighbor, thou shouldst not mingle foreign matters with it, nor from revenge reveal secrets which weigh heavily against thy neighbor.—LANGE (on ver. 11); In religious discourses heart and mouth must agree; the orator must besides always examine what is best adapted to his congregation: 1 Pet. iv. 11.—[BP. HOPKINS: As the amiableness of all duties consists in the right timing and placing of them, so especially of this holy and spiritual discourse].—HASIUS (on ver. 12): He who can hearken and gladly hearkens to rational reproofs, does his ears a far better service thereby, than if he adorned them with jewels of the finest gold, and with genuine pearls.

Vers. 13 sq. LUTHER (marginal comment on ver. 13): A true servant or subject is not to be paid for with gold.—STARKE (on ver. 13): A chief characteristic of able teachers of the divine word is that they as stewards over the mysteries of God (1 Cor. iv. 1, 2) seek to be found faithful.—(On ver. 14); Satan promises mountains of gold, but gives only smoke and empty vapor. Jesus keeps His word plenteously above all requests or understanding.—(On ver. 15): He who will everywhere put his head through the wall, will hardly succeed. But how beautiful and salutary is it to be gentle and full of love!—ZELTNER (on vers. 16, 17): Of all things, even the most charming and lovely one becomes at last weary. Therefore there is nothing better or more blessed than to strive for heaven and the eternal, where satiety is without weariness (John iv. 14), life without death (John vi. 50; Col. iii. 1, 2).

Vers. 19 sq. STARKE: Beside the confidence of believers in God every other hope is deceptive and unreliable as a brittle cake of ice or as a bending reed.—(On ver. 20): Even joyful music is not able to drive away cares and troubled thoughts, but an edifying song of the cross or of consolation may do it; Ps. cxix. 92; Col. iii. 16.—*Tübingen Bible* (on vers. 21, 22): True wisdom teaches us by gentleness to break down the haughtiness of enemies, and even to win them to one's self by benefits: Matth. v. 44 sq. But how excellent is it not merely to know these rules of wisdom, but also to practise them!—[TRAPP: Thus should a Christian punish his pursuers; no vengeance but this is heroical and fit for imitation.—ARNOT: This is peculiarly "the grace of the Lord Jesus." When He was lifted up on the cross He gave the keynote of the Christian life: "Father, forgive them." The Gospel must come in such power as to turn the inner life upside down ere any real progress can be made in this difficult department of social duty].

Vers. 23-28. GEIER (on ver. 23): Cultivate sincerity and honor, that thou mayest not speak evil things in his absence of one whom thou meetest to his face with all friendliness.—[BRIDGES: The backbiting tongue wounds four at one stroke—the backbiter himself, the object of his attack, the hearer, and the name of God].—ZELTNER (on ver. 25): When we hear from distant lands the glad news of the course of the gospel among the heathen, it must cause us hearty rejoicing, and urge us to thanksgiving to God (an application then of ver. 25 for a missionary festival sermon).—STARKE (on ver. 26): As a fountain made foul becomes in time pure and clear again, so likewise the stained innocence of

Digitized by Google

a righteous man will in due time be revealed again in its purity; Ps. xxxvii. 6.—(On ver. 27): The laborious and diligent will never lack work, and the more vigorous and systematic he is in it, the more honor does it bring him.—*Calwer Handb.* (on ver. 27): Search not into things too hard.—Starke (on ver. 28): A man who cannot govern himself cannot be usefully employed in conducting public affairs.—[Bates: Satan hath an easy entrance into such men, and brings along with him a train of evils].

---

2. Various Warnings, *viz.:*

a) Against dishonorable conduct,

(*especially folly, sloth and malice*).

Chap. XXVI.

1 As snow in summer and rain in harvest,
so honor befitteth not the fool.
2 As the sparrow flitting, as the swallow flying,
so the curse undeserved: it cometh not.
3 A whip for the horse, a bridle for the ass,
and a rod for the fool's back.
4 Answer not a fool according to his folly,
lest thou be like him.
5 Answer a fool according to his folly,
lest he become wise in his own eyes.
6 He cutteth off the feet, he drinketh damage,
who sendeth a message by a fool.
7 Take away the legs of the lame,
and the proverb in the mouth of a fool.
8 As a bag of jewels on a heap of stones,
so is he that giveth honor to a fool.
9 As a thorny staff that riseth up in the hand of a drunkard,
so is a proverb in the mouth of a fool.
10 An archer that woundeth everything,
and he that hireth a fool, and hireth vagrants (are alike).
11 As a dog that returneth to his vomit,
so the fool (ever) repeateth his folly.
12 Seest thou a man wise in his own eyes,
there is more hope of a fool than of him.—
13 The slothful saith: There is a lion in the way,
a lion in the midst of the streets.
14 The door turneth on its hinges,
and the slothful on his bed.
15 The slothful thrusteth his hand in the dish;
he is too sluggish to bring it to his mouth again.
16 The sluggard is wiser in his own eyes,
than seven (men) who give wise judgment.
17 He layeth hold on the ears of a dog
who passing by is excited by strife that is not his.
18 As a madman who casteth fiery darts,
arrows and death,
19 so is the man that deceiveth his neighbor,
and saith: Am I not in sport?
20 Where the wood faileth the fire goeth out,
and where there is no talebearer the strife ceaseth.

Digitized by Google

21 Coal to burning coals and wood to fire;
so is a contentious man to kindle strife.
22 The words of the talebearer are as sportive (words),
but they go down to the innermost part of the breast.
23 Silver dross spread over a potsherd,—
(so are) glowing lips and a wicked heart.
24 With his lips the hater dissembleth,
and within him he layeth up deceit.
25 When he speaketh fair believe him not;
for seven abominations are in his heart.
26 Hatred is covered by deceit,
(yet) his wickedness shall be exposed in the assembly.
27 He that diggeth a pit falleth into it,
and he that rolleth a stone, upon himself shall it return.
28 The lying tongue hateth those that are wounded by it,
and a flattering mouth will cause offence.

GRAMMATICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 3. [The form גֵו (comp. x. 13; xix. 29) is ordinarily explained as derived from גֵּוָה the more common גַּו (Lex., גֵּו) as from גֵּוו; Bött. (§ 498, 17) suggests that the form גֵו is used, as in numerous similar cases the forms with weaker, flatter vowels are employed, to convey in their very sound the idea of the weak, the suffering, the miserable; גֵו then, in every instance except perhaps one, is used to describe a back that is beaten or threatened.—לַחֲמוֹר, a form with the article, as is indicated not by the vocalization alone, but by the parallel לַסּוּס; Bött. I., p. 403, n. 1.—A.].

Ver. 6. [מְקַצֶּה a Piel part., therefore active in its meaning, and not to be rendered by a passive, nor need it be exchanged for the Pual (pass.) part. as Ewald proposes. The emendations of מְקַצֶּה רַגְלַיִם in clause *a* which have been proposed by recent expositors are unnecessary; *e. g.*, Ewald's reading מְקֻצָּה רג׳ "is deprived of his feet, *etc.*" Hitzig would read מִקְצֵה רג׳ immediately connecting the following words; "from the end of the feet he swallows injury (?!) who sends messages by a fool."—A.].

Ver. 7. דַּלְיוּ is taken most simply as Imper. Piel from דָּלָה, to "lift out, draw out" (Ps. xxx. 2). [So Fuerst; Gesen, § 141, 1; Nordh. § 452. Bött. § 1123, 4, and § 300 *b*, makes it from דלל. This resolution of ל and substitution of י for the second ל Bött. regards as a probable sign and characteristic of the Ephraimite dialect which he is inclined to find in this section of the Book of Proverbs. Gesen., *Thes.*, was at first disposed to take it from דלל, but in the supplement brought out by Rödiger appears to have changed his view, taking it as a fuller form of דַּלּוּ. The rendering of Bött., *etc.*, would be "the legs of the lame hang useless."—A.].

Ver. 14. [תִּסּוֹב, illustrates Böttcher's *Fiens solitum*, "is wont to turn," and in ver. 20 תִּכְבֶּה and יִשְׁתֹּק his *Fiens debitum*: "must go out, must cease." See *Lehrb.* § 950, *b*, and *c*, *e*.—A.].

Ver. 18. כְּמִתְלַהְלֵהַּ from להה or perhaps from a root הלה still preserved in the Arabic.

Ver. 26. [תִּכַּסֶּה; the ת of the Hithp. prefix is elsewhere not assimilated.—A.].

Ver. 28. [לָשׁוֹן as here used Bött. regards as one of the traces of an Ephraimite dialect, the noun with this meaning being otherwise feminine.—דַּכָּיו Gesen. derives from דַּךְ in the active sense the form being plural with suff. and the construction acc. as object. Fuerst makes it a peculiar derivative (without suffix) from דָּכָה in the sense of "bowed down, humble, pious." Bött. pointing דָּכְיוֹ as the K'thibh, makes it from דְּכִי with the suffix of the singular. See Exegetical notes for the various interpretations.—A.].

EXEGETICAL.

1. Vers. 1–3. Three proverbs against folly, symmetrical in their structure (in each case bringing two related ideas into comparison).—**As snow in summer and rain in harvest.** According to Jerome, Comm. in Am. iv. 7, rain in harvest time is in Palestine a thing not heard of, and even impossible. Comp. 1 Sam. xii. 17 sq., where a sudden thunderstorm at this season appears as a miracle from God, and also the confirmatory statements of modern observers, like Robinson, *Pal.* II. 307: "In ordinary years no rain at all falls from the end of the spring-showers till October or November, and the sky is almost always clear," *etc.*—Comp. furthermore the remarks above on chap. xxv. 13, as well as, for clause *b*, chap. xix. 10; and also ver. 8 below.—Ver. 2.—**As the sparrow flitting, as the swallow flying**: lit. "as the sparrow for fleeing or wandering, as the swallow flying," *viz.* is *fitted*. Comp. the similar construction in chap. xxv. 3, and also the similar comparison in xxvii. 8. [The Inf. with ל may be rendered by the abl. as readily as by the dative of the gerund or verbal noun; *by* or *in respect to* flying, *etc.*]—**So the curse** (that is) **undeserved: it cometh not.** "A curse that is in vain, that has been uttered without just

Digitized by Google

ground, that is unmerited," like that, *e. g.*, in 2 Sam. xvi. 5 sq., or that in 1 Kings ii. 8. For the "in vain" comp. xxiv. 28 and the remarks on the passage.—Instead of לֹא תָבֹא K'ri calls for לוֹ תָבֹא: "to him, to the fool who utters it, will it return," it will find its fulfilment in his own case (thus the Vulg. and JARCHI). But the verbal expression agrees poorly enough with this rendering, and moreover the two comparisons in *a* plainly favor rather the idea expressed by the K'thibh. [Such a curse is then fugitive, transient as a bird; it does not come to stay. The E. V. suggests the idea very blindly. TRAPP explains: "As these may fly where they will, and nobody cares or is the worse; so here." He would carry the comparison farther: as birds after their aimless flight return to their nest, "so the causeless curse returns to the authors. Cursing men are cursed men." A.]—Ver. 3. Comp. x. 13; xix. 29; Ecclesiast. xxx. 25–27.—The assertion of J. D. MICHAELIS that the ideas "whip" and "bridle" in clause *a* are not rightly distributed between the horse and the ass, is refuted by Nah. iii. 2; Ezek. xxxix. 9, where express mention is made of riding whips in connection with horses, as well as by Ps. xxxii. 9, where with horses mules are also mentioned as bridled animals. [GESEN. *Thes.*, *s. v.*, abundantly illustrates the nobler nature of the Eastern ass, and the higher estimate put upon it. See also HOUGHTON's article in SMITH's *Dictionary of the Bible*, I. 182, Am. Ed. A.]

2. Vers. 4–12. Eight additional proverbs directed against the folly of fools (among them one consisting of two verses, vers. 4, 5).—**Answer not a fool according to his folly**, *i. e.*, speak not with him in accordance with his folly, conforming thyself to it, imitating it, and thereby becoming thyself a fool. On the other hand, ver. 5: **Answer a fool according to his folly**, *i. e.*, serve him in his senseless babbling with an appropriate, sharply decisive retort, use with the coarse block (blockhead) the heavy wedge that belongs to it. The proverb in ver. 5 does not then stand as a restriction on the meaning of ver. 4 (as EWALD holds), but yet adjusting it, and guarding against what might be misunderstood in the former language. [Says ANDREW FULLER: The terms in the first instance mean "in a foolish manner," as is manifest from the reason given. In the second instance they mean "in the manner which his folly requires." This is also plain from the reason given. A foolish speech is not a rule for our imitation; nevertheless our answer must be so framed by it as to meet and repel it. "This knot will be easily loosed," says MUFFET, "if it be observed that there are two sorts of answers, the one in folly, the other unto folly." A.]

Ver. 6. **He cutteth off the feet, he drinketh damage, who sendeth a message by a fool.** Comp. the two figurative expressions in clause *a*, the first ("he cutteth off the feet," *i. e.*, his own feet, *amputat sibi pedes*—MICHAELIS, SCHELLING, BERTHEAU, ELSTER, STIER, [KAMPH. WORDSW.] *etc.*,) means: he deprives himself of the means of attaining the end, he puts himself into a helpless condition; [and the idea is better expressed in this way than if we adopt the explanation of H., N., S., M.; he acts as though he cut off the feet of his messenger who chooses a fool for the errand. N. errs in completing a proposition in clause *a*: "he that has his feet cut off drinks damage." A.] The second phrase "he drinketh injury or wrong," according to Job xxi. 20; xxxiv. 7, is equivalent to "he suffers abuses, he experiences in the largest measure an injury self-devised." For similar use of the term "words" in the sense of commands, directions, a message, comp. Ex. iv. 13; 2 Sam. xv. 36. For the general meaning compare like complaints of bad and foolish messengers in x. 26; xxv. 13.

Ver. 7. **Take away the legs from the lame.** The verb דלה appears to be used here with the meaning, which it is true is not to be discovered elsewhere, of *tollere*, to take away. For the meaning of the comparison, according to *b*, seems to be this: Always take from the lame his legs, (*i. e.*, his lame legs), *for they are really useless to him*, just as the "proverb," (*i. e.*, the maxim of wisdom, the Maschal) in the mouth of the fool is useless, something that might without loss be never there; for the fool is and continues still a fool (ver. 9; xii. 16; xiv. 24, *etc.*). Thus UMBREIT, BERTHEAU, STIER [STUART, KAMPH.] correctly explain, while the rest take some one and some another way to explain the peculiarly obscure and difficult דַּלְיוּ. So LUTHER takes the phrase altogether arbitrarily in the sense of "to dance" ("as dancing to a cripple, so does it befit a fool to speak of wisdom"); in like manner JARCHI and LEVI BEN GERSON ("his legs are too long for the lame," דליו being taken as equivalent to גָּבְהוּ), and also GEIER, ROSENM, J. H. MICHAELIS, SCHELLING, *etc.*, who take דליו as a substantive equivalent to דַּלְיוּת in the sense of *elevatio*. [The E. V. renders "the legs of the lame are not equal"]. EWALD and ELSTER read דָּלְיוּ, "the legs of the lame are too loose" (ABEN EZRA had already given a similar rendering) [GESEN., "hang down," so DE W., N., WORDSW.; "are weak," H. M.]. HITZIG finally gives the Inf. abs. דּלוֹג: "leaping of the legs on the part of a lame man—so is a proverb in the mouth of a fool," (the same meaning, therefore, substantially as in LUTHER's conception.)

Ver. 8. **As a bag of jewels on a heap of stones, so is he that giveth honor to a fool.** If the noun מַרְגֵּמָה which occurs only here expresses the idea "heap of stones," *acervus lapidum*, which is altogether probable from its derivation from רגם, to stone, to heap up stones, then the צְרוֹר אֶבֶן must be a parcel not of common, but of precious stones (comp. Ex. xxviii. 9; xxxv. 27, where אֶבֶן alone stands for *lapis pretiosior*), and this all the more since the 2d clause makes this rendering peculiarly natural. So R. LEVI BEN GERSON, then LUTHER, GEIER, SCHULTENS, GESENIUS, UMBREIT, STIER, ELSTER, [E. V. in margin, DE W., N., W.],—of whom LUTHER, GEIER, SCHULTENS, STIER [WORDSW.] think particularly of a heap of stones raised by the stoning of a malefactor, a *tumulus aggestus supra corpus lapidatum*, which is certainly more natural than with

Digitized by Google

JEROME, (Vulg., *acervus Mercurii*), several of the early Rabbis, JARCHI, V. E. LÖSCHER (in the "*Unschuldigen Nachrichten*," Vol. 18, p. 496), and OETINGER, to think of a Hermes, a heap of stones dedicated to Mercury (λόφος ἑρμαῖον, *statua mercurialis*). Others (BERTHEAU, EWALD [FUERST, KAMPH., E. V., in text, H., S., M.] *etc.*,) following the LXX and Chald., take מַרְגֵּמָה in the sense of "sling," and regard צְרוֹר as an Infin.; "as the binding a stone fast to the sling";—but against this may be maintained the inappositeness of the figure as compared with the idea in clause *b*, and the fact that such a meaning cannot be proved to belong to the noun, and the circumstance that the sling is elsewhere always called קֶלַע.—HITZIG: "as a little stone on the beam of a balance," *etc.*,—for he says the noun מ means, according to the Arabic, the "beam of a balance," and צ אב signifies a "bit or kernel of stone," a little stone serving to bind the balance (?).

Ver. 9. **A thorny staff that riseth up in the hand of a drunkard,** (so is) a (wise) **proverb in the mouth of a fool.** If in ver. 7 a Maschal, a maxim of wisdom, taken into the mouth of a fool was represented as something useless, destitute of all aim and effect, it here appears rather as something working absolute harm, wounding, injuring like thorns, and in particular like an instrument of correction heedlessly carried, striking in the wrong place, and so grossly misused. Comp. LUTHER'S marginal note, which in the main point certainly interprets correctly: when a drunkard carries and brandishes in his hand a sweet briar, he scratches more with it than he allows the roses to be smelled; so a fool with the Scriptures or a judicial maxim oft causes more harm than profit."—HITZIG following the LXX, reads in clause *b* מֹשֵׁל instead of מָשָׁל, and furthermore takes the verb of clause *a* in the sense of "to shoot up," and therefore renders: Thorns shoot up by (under) the hand of the hireling (?) and tyranny by the mouth of fools." But we do not need to give to the verb here even as a secondary meaning the sense of growing up (as EWALD, UMBREIT, STIER propose), as the simple original meaning of rising up; raising itself gives a meaning in every way satisfactory. [The rendering of the E. V., H., W., "as a thorn goeth up into the hand," *etc.*, wounding unconsciously, is less forcible every way than that of the author, with whom DE W., K., BERTHEAU, N., S., M., *etc.*, agree. A.]

Ver. 10. **An archer that woundeth everything** (for this meaning comp. רַב, "an archer or dartsman," comp. Jer. l. 29; Job xvi. 13; for the verb in this sense, Is. li. 9), **and he that hireth a fool, and he that hireth vagrants** ("passers by," *i. e.*, therefore untried, unreliable persons, who soon run away again)—are alike; one of the three is as foolish as another. This interpretation, which is followed by SCHELLING, EWALD, BERTHEAU, STIER, [DE W., KAMPH., and virtually S. and M.], involves it is true a certain hardness, especially in the relation of the figure in *a* to the two ideas in *b*; it corresponds best, however, with the simple literal meaning of the passage. LUTHER, GEIER, SEB. SCHMID, [N., WORDSW.] render: "A master formeth all aright," *magister format omnia recte*; in a similar way ELSTER: "An able man formeth all himself" (in contrast with the fool, who seeks to hire others, and even incompetent persons of all sorts, stragglers and vagrants, *etc.*, to transact his business). [The E. V., which is followed against his will by HOLDEN, interprets the "master" as God: "the great God," *etc.*]. UMBREIT and HITZIG [with another common meaning of רב]: "*Much* produceth *all*," as though the meaning were similar to that in the ὅστις ἔχει δοθήσεται αὐτῷ, Matt. xiii. 11; xxv. 29. Others read רִב instead of רַב, *e. g.*, the Vulg., *judicium determinat causas*, and of recent expositors ZIEGLER, *etc.*

Ver. 11. **As a dog that returneth to his vomit** (comp. the New Testament citation of this passage in 2 Pet. ii. 22) **so the fool** (ever) **repeateth his folly**; lit., "so comes the fool for the second time again with his folly," comp. xvii. 9. Here is plainly meant not merely a constantly renewed return to foolish assertions in spite of all the rational grounds adduced against them, but a falling again into foolish courses of action after brief endeavors or beginnings at improvement (comp. Matt. xii. 46; John v. 14; Heb. vi. 4-8.)

Ver. 12. **Seest thou a man wise in his own eyes,** *i. e.*, who holds himself as wise, and by this very blind over-estimate of himself thoroughly and forever bars for himself the way to true wisdom (comp. xxx. 12), like the Pharisees mentioned in John ix. 41, who gave it out that they saw, but were in truth stone-blind.—With *b* compare chap. xxix. 20, where this 2d clause recurs literally.

3. Vers. 13-16. **Four proverbs against sloth.**—Ver. 13. Comp. the almost identical proverb in chap. xxii. 13.—**A lion is in the way.** שַׁחַל a synonym of אֲרִי designates the lion as a *roaring* animal, as *rugiens sive rugitor;* it does not contrast the male lion with the lioness (Vulg.), or again the young lion with the full grown, (LUTHER).

Ver. 14. Comp. vi. 10; xxiv. 33. With this figure of the door ever turning on its hinges but never moving from its place comp. the well-known words of SCHILLER—"*dreht sich träg und dumm wie des Färber's Gaul im Ring herum*" [turns lazy and stupid like the dyer's nag round in its circle.]

Ver. 15. Comp. the almost identical proverb, chap. xix. 24.

Ver. 16.—**The sluggard is wiser in his own eyes** (comp. ver. 12) **than seven men who give a wise answer.** The number seven stands here not because it is the sacred number, but to express the idea of plurality in a concrete and popular way. Comp. ver. 25; also vi. 31; xxiv. 16; Jer. xv. 9; 1 Sam. ii. 5; Ecclesiast. xxxvii. 14.—With this use of טַעַם "taste" in the sense of "understanding, judgment," comp. 1 Sam. xxi. 14; xxiii. 33; Ps. cxix. 66; Job xii. 20; also remarks above on Prov. xi. 22, where is denoted in addition a quality of the moral life. "To give back understanding" is naturally equivalent to giving an intelligent, wise answer, as a sign of an intelligent disposition; comp. xvii. 18.

Digitized by Google

4. Vers. 17-19. Against delight in strife and wilful provocation.—**He layeth hold on the ears of a dog** (and so provokes the animal outright to barking and biting) **who passing by is excited by strife that is not his**, lit., "over a dispute not for him" (comp. Hab. ii. 6). For the use of this verb "to provoke or excite one's self," comp. the remark on xx. 2. This מִתְעַבֵּר with the Part. עֹבֵר forms an alliteration or *polyptoton* which (with STIER) may be substantially reproduced in German: "*wer vorübergehend sich übergehen* (*sich die Galle überlaufen*) *lässt*," *etc.* There is no occasion for HITZIG's assumption, that instead of מִתְעַבֵּר there stood originally in the text the מִתְעָרֵב which is expressed by the Syriac and Vulg.; "he who *meddleth* in strife," *etc.* [The E. V. has taken this doubtless under the influence of those early versions.]

Vers. 18, 19. **As a madman who casteth fiery darts, arrows and death.** The מִתְלַהְלֵהַּ which occurs only here, signifies, according to SYMMACHUS, the Vers. Venet., and ABEN EZRA, one beside himself or insane (ἐξεστώς, πειρώμενος). For the combination of the three ideas, fiery darts, arrows and death (*i. e.* deadly missiles), comp. the similar grouping in xxv. 18 *a*.—**So the man that deceiveth his neighbor.** רִמָּה is to "deceive, to deal craftily," not to "afflict" (UMBREIT), or "overthrow" (VAN ESS).—**And** (then) **saith: Am I not in sport?** The meaning of the simple "and saith" the Vulgate paraphrases correctly when it renders: "*et cum deprehensus fuerit, dicit,*" *etc.* ["Quipping and flouting," says MUFFET, "is counted the flower and grace of men's speech, and especially of table talk; but the hurt that cometh by this flower is as bitter as wormwood, and the disgrace which this grace casteth upon men is fouler than any dirt of the street."—A.]

5. Vers. 20-28. Nine proverbs against malice and deceit.—**Where the wood faileth the fire goeth out**, *etc.* Comp. the Arabic proverb expressing the same idea, aimed at slander (in SCHEID, *Selecta*, p. 18): "He who layeth no wood on the fire keeps it from burning." For this description of the "slanderer" comp. xvi. 28.

Ver. 21. The direct opposite to the contents of the preceding verse.—**Coals to burning coals**; lit., black coals to burning coals. For the "man of contentions" in clause *b* comp. xxi. 9; xxvii. 15.

With ver. 22 compare the literally identical proverb xviii 8.

Ver. 23. **Silver dross spread over a potsherd.** "Silver of dross" is impure silver not yet properly freed from the dross, and therefore partly spurious (Vulg., *argentum sordidum*), and not some such thing as a glazing with the glitter of silver made of plumbago (*Lithargyrus*), and so imitation of silver, as many think, and as LUTHER seems to have expressed in his "*Silberschaum.*" חֶרֶשׂ, potsherd (Isa. xliv. 11), seems to be used intentionally instead of כְּלִי־חֶרֶשׂ "an earthen vessel," to strengthen the impression of the worthlessness of the object named.—(So are) **burning lips**, *i. e.* fiery protestations of friendship, or it may be warm kisses (which BERTHEAU understands to be the specific meaning), which in connection with a genuinely good heart on the part of the giver are a sign of true love, but with a "wicked heart" are on the contrary repulsive demonstrations of hypocrisy, without any moral worth (comp. the kiss of Judas, Matt. xxvi. 48 sq.). It is unnecessary to read with HITZIG חֲלָקִים, "smooth lips," instead of דֹּלְקִים, "burning" lips.

Vers. 24, 25. **With his lips the hater dissembleth.** For the verb which may not here, as in xx. 11, be translated "is recognized" (so LUTHER, following the Chald. and Vulg.), comp. the Hithp. of נָכַר, which elsewhere expresses the idea of "dissembling," *e. g.* Gen. xlii. 7; 1 Kings xiv. 5, 6.—**And within he prepareth deceit.** Comp. Jer. ix. 7, and with שִׁית מִרְמָה "to set, contrive, prepare deceit," compare the "setting or preparing snares," Ps. cxl. 6.—**For seven abominations are in his heart.** See remarks above, on ver. 16, and comp. the seven devils of Matt. xii. 45, which represent an intensified power in present moral deformity. That there is a specific reference to the six or seven abominations mentioned in chap. vi. 16-19, is an arbitrary conjecture of ABEN EZRA.

Ver. 26. **Hatred is covered by deceit.** מַשָּׁאוֹן from נָשָׁא, "to deceive," is doubtless correctly understood by the LXX, when they express the idea by δόλος (comp. also the *fraudulenter* of the Vulg.); here it designates specifically "hypocrisy, the deception of friendly language used to one's face" (UMBREIT). The suffix in רָעָתוֹ refers then by an obvious *constructio ad sensum* to him who conceals his hatred in this hypocritical way. The second clause gives assurance then of the certain occurrence of an exposure of this flatterer "in the assembly," *i. e.* before the congregation of his people assembled for judgment, who perhaps through some judicial process that ends unfortunately for him come to the knowledge of his villanies. HITZIG partially following the LXX (ὁ κρύπτων ἔχθραν συνίστησι δόλον), renders: He who concealeth hatred, devising mischief (?), his vileness is exposed in the assembly."

Ver. 27. **He that diggeth a pit falleth into it.** Comp. Eccles. x. 8; Ecclesiast. xxvii. 26; Ps. ix. 16, and with respect to the "falling back of the stone that has been (wickedly) rolled" in clause *b*, comp. Ps. vii. 17; Matt. xxi. 44.

Ver. 28. **The lying tongue hateth those that are wounded by it.** If the reading דַּכָּיו is correct this may be the rendering, and the "crushed" (plural of דַּךְ [E. V. the oppressed], Ps. ix. 10; x. 18; lxxiv. 21), *i. e.* the bruised (or oppressed or wounded—see UMBREIT and STIER on this passage) of the lying tongue, are then those whom this tongue has bruised or wounded, the victims of its wickedness—and not those possibly whom it proposes to wound or oppress (UMBREIT, DE W., VAN ESS), or again those who wound, *i. e.* punish it (*conterentes sive castigantes ipsam*—LUTHER, GEIER, GESENIUS).

Digitized by Google

Inasmuch, however, as the proposition is by no means universally and in every case true, that the lying tongue, or that detraction hates its own victims, and since besides the second clause seems to demand another sense, it might be justifiable to read with EWALD and HITZIG אֲדֹנָיו; accordingly "the lying tongue hates *its own master*," *i. e.* it hurls him into calamity, brings him to ruin—a meaning which also corresponds admirably with ver. 27. [See Critical notes for the three chief explanations of the form and derivation of the word. The passive rendering has this advantage, that it makes the fourth instance correspond with the other three in which the word is used; this presumption must be decidedly overthrown. This we do not think is done; so the E. V., H., N., S., M., W., KAMPH., *etc.* —A.] For the noun rendered "offence," in clause *b*, comp., moreover, the cognate verb in clause *a* of xiv. 32.

DOCTRINAL, ETHICAL, HOMILETIC AND PRACTICAL.

It is mainly three forms of dishonorably and morally contemptible conduct, against which the condemning language of the proverbs in this section is directed; foolishness or folly in the narrower sense (vers. 1-12;) sloth (vers. 13-16); and a wicked maliciousness (vers. 17-28), which displays itself at one time as a wilful contentiousness and disposition to annoy (17-19), and at another as an artful calumniation and hypocritical slandering (20-28). Original ethical truths, such as have not appeared in previous chapters, are expressed only to a limited extent in the proverbs which relate to these vices. The novelty is found more in the peculiarly pointed and figurative form which distinguishes in an extraordinary degree the maxims of this chapter above others. Yet there are now and then essentially new ideas; what is said in ver. 2 of the futility of curses that are groundless; in vers. 4, 5 of uttering the truth staunchly to fools without becoming foolish one's self; in vers. 7 and 9 of the senselessness and even harmfulness of proverbs of wisdom in the mouth of a fool; in vers. 12 of the incapability of improvement in conceited fools who deem themselves wise; and finally in vers. 27, 28 of the self-destroying reflex power of malicious counsels formed against one's neighbor.

Homily on the chapter as a whole.—Of three kinds of vices which the truly wise man must avoid: 1) folly; 2) sloth; 3) wicked artifice.—STÖCKER: What kinds of people are worthy of no honor: 1) fools; 2) sluggards or idlers; 3) lovers of contention and brawling.—STARKE: A (warning) lesson on folly, sloth and deceitfulness.

Vers. 1-6. *Würtemberg Bible* (on ver. 1):—Honor is a reward of virtue and ability; wilt thou be honored, then first become virtuous and wise!—MELANCHTHON (on ver. 2): As a consolation against all calumnies and unjust detraction the assurance of the divine word serves us,—that false (groundless) curses, though they momentarily harm and wound, yet in the end appear in their nothingness, and are cast aside, in accordance with the saying: truth may indeed be repressed for a time, but not perish (Ps. xciv. 15; 2 Cor. iv. 9). ["Truth crushed to earth shall rise again; the eternal years of God are hers."—LAWSON: The curses of such men instead of being prejudicial, will be very useful to us, if we are wise enough to imitate the conduct of David, whose meekness was approved, his prayers kindled into a flame of desires, and his hopes invigorated by them].—GEIER (on ver. 3): One may not flatter his own unruly flesh and blood, but must seek to keep it properly in check.—STARKE (on vers. 4, 5): Great wisdom is needful to meet the different classes of our adversaries in an appropriate way.—(On ver. 6): Important concerns one should commit to skilful and able servants.

Vers. 7-12. LUTHER (Marginal comment on ver. 7): Fools ought not to be wise and yet will be always affecting wisdom.—[TRAPP: If thy tongue speak by the talent, but thine hands scarce work by the ounce, thou shalt pass for a Pharisee (Matt. xxiii. 3). They spake like angels, lived like devils; had heaven commonly at their tongue ends, but the world continually at their finger ends].—STARKE (on vers. 7, 9): He who will teach others in divine wisdom, must first have mastered it himself (Ecclesiast. xviii. 19); then he will not only teach with profit, but also have honor from it.—(On ver. 9): He who misuses God's word does himself thereby the greatest injury.—(On ver. 8): Beware of all flattering of the ungodly; for one prepares himself thereby but a poor reward.—(On ver. 10): As is the master so is the servant. Bad masters like bad servants.—(On vers. 11): If all relapses in sickness are dangerous, so much more relapses into old sins.—(On ver. 12): Self-pleasing and self-relaxation is the prolific mother of many other follies.—WOHLFARTH (on ver. 12): Let no one esteem himself perfect, but let every one strive for humility and cherish it as his most sacred possession.—[LAWSON (on ver. 8): But does not God Himself often give honor to fools? Yes. He is the judge of nations who has a right to punish men by subjecting them to the power of fools. We are to regulate our conduct not by His secret but His revealed will.—ARNOT (on ver. 11): When the unrenewed heart and the pollutions of the world are, after a temporary separation, brought together again, the two in their unholy wedlock become "one flesh." Man's true need—God's sufficient cure is "Create in me a clean heart, and renew a right spirit within me."—J. EDWARDS (on ver. 12): Those who are wise in their own eyes are some of the least likely to get good of any in the world.—BRIDGES: The natural fool has only one hinderance—his own ignorance. The conceited fool has two—ignorance and self-delusion].

Vers. 13-16. LANGE: That the weeds of sin are ever getting the upper hand as well in hearts as in the Church, comes from this, that men do not enough watch and pray, but only lounge, are idle and sleepy: 1 Thess. v. 6.—*Berleburg Bible:* The sluggard remains year in year out sitting on the heap of his self-chosen convenient Christianity, reads, hears, prays, sings in the Church year after year, and makes no progress, never comes to an inner complete knowledge of truth;

Digitized by Google

just as the door always remains in one place, although it turns this way and that the whole year through, and swings on its hinges. This slothfulness is the mother of all the doctrines which encourage the old Adam, and in the matter of sanctification throw out the "cannot," where it is a "will not" that hides behind.—WOHLFARTH: The sluggard's wisdom. Rest is to him the sole end of life; only in indolence does he feel happy, *etc.*

Vers. 17-19. STARKE (on ver. 17): To mix one's self in strange matters from forwardness and with no call, has usually a bad issue.—OSIANDER (on vers. 18, 19): In the sight of God the wantonness and wickedness of the heart are not hid; moreover He does not let them go unpunished.—ZELTNER: Crafty friends are much more dangerous and injurious than open enemies.—LANGE: It testifies of no small wickedness when one alleges quite innocent intentions in injuring another, and yet with all is only watching an opportunity to give him a blow.

Vers. 20-28. HASIUS (on vers. 20 sq.): There would not be so much dispute and strife among men if there were not so many base spirits who nourish and promote it in every way.—STARKE: Slanders and contentions are to be regarded as a flame to which one should not supply wood, but rather water to quench them.—[TRAPP (on ver. 23): Counterfeit friends are nought on both sides].—VON GERLACH (on ver. 26): Though a deceitful man may succeed in cheating individuals, yet this is not possible before the whole Church (Acts v. 1-11).—(On ver. 27): A hypocritical tongue if it has injured any one follows him still further with lies to defend itself, and so it causes universal confusion.

---

b) Against vain self-praise and presumption.

CHAP. XXVII.

(*With an admonition to prudence and frugality in agriculture: vers.* 23-27).

1 Boast not thyself of to-morrow,
for thou knowest not what a day will bring forth.
2 Let another praise thee and not thine own mouth,
a stranger and not thine own lips.
3 Stone is heavy and sand weighty;
the fool's wrath is heavier than them both.
4 Anger is cruel and wrath is outrageous;
but who can stand before jealousy?
5 Better is open rebuke
than secret love.
6 Faithful are the wounds of a friend,
but the kisses of an enemy are deceitful.
7 The satisfied soul loatheth a honeycomb;
to a hungry soul every bitter thing is sweet.
8 As a bird that wandereth from her nest
so is a man that wandereth from his home.
9 Oil and perfume rejoice the heart,
but the sweetness of a friend is better than one's own counsel.
10 Thine own friend and thy father's friend forsake not;
and into thy brother's house enter not in the day of thy calamity;
better is a neighbor that is near than a brother far off.
11 Be wise, my son, and make my heart glad,
that I may know how to give an answer to him that reproacheth me.
12 The prudent man seeth the evil (and) hideth himself;
the simple pass on and are punished.
13 Take his garment, for he hath become surety for a stranger,
and on account of a strange woman put him under bonds!
14 He that blesseth his friend with a loud voice early in the morning,
let it be reckoned a curse to him!

Digitized by Google

15 A continual dropping in a very rainy day
and a contentious woman are alike.
16 He that will restrain her restraineth the wind,
and his right hand graspeth after oil.
17 Iron sharpeneth iron;
so doth a man sharpen the face of his friend.
18 Whosoever watcheth the fig-tree eateth its fruit,
and he that hath regard to his master is honored.
19 As in water face (answereth) to face
so the heart of man to man.
20 Hell and destruction are never full,
and the eyes of man are not satisfied.
21 The fining pot is for silver and the furnace for gold,
but man according to his glorying.
22 Though thou bruise a fool in a mortar
among grain with a pestle,
his folly will not depart from him.
23 Thou shalt know well the face of thy sheep;
direct thy mind to thine herds;
24 for riches are not forever,
and doth the crown endure forevermore?
25 The grass disappeareth, and the tender grass is seen,
and the herbs of the mountains are gathered.
26 Lambs (are) for thy clothing
and the price of thy field (is) goats;
27 and abundance of goat's milk for thy food, for the food of thine house,
and subsistence for thy maidens.

GRAMMATICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 4. אַכְזְרִיּוּת is used here only in the Old Testament.

Ver. 5. [טֹובָה is regarded by Bött. (§ 1133, 1 and n 3) as the 3d sing. fem. of the verb and not as the fem. of the adj.; the chief evidence being found in the participles following, which, according to Hebrew usage, more naturally follow a finite verb.—A.]

Ver. 9. [In רֵעֵהוּ we have one of the examples found in Hebrew in connection with words in wide and frequent use, in which the suffix loses all distinct and specific application; comp. in modern languages *Monsieur*, *Madonna*, *Mynheer*, *etc.*; therefore *one's* friend, *a* friend, and not *his* friend. Bött., § 876, *c.* עֲצַת is regarded by Gesen., Fuerst, Döderlein, Dathe, *etc.*, as a fem. of עֵץ used collectively; the meaning in connection with נָפֶשׁ is then, "more than fragrant wood." Bött. (§ 643, δ) pronounces all the examples cited in the lexicons for this use of the noun "more than doubtful;" and, as the exegetical notes show, nearly all commentators give to עֵצָה its ordinary meaning.—A.]

Ver. 10. [רֵעֶה is one of three nouns whose full and original form appears only in the *stat. constr.*; the K'ri therefore points as though the *absol.* were used רֵעַ, while the K'thibh exhibits the form רֵעֶה. See Green, § 215, 1, *e*; Bött. §§ 721, 8; 794, Decl. IV.—A.]

Ver. 11. [וְאָשִׁיבָה an Intentional, or paragogic Imperf., connected to Imperatives by וְ used as a final conjunction, "in order that:" Bött., § 965, *B*, *c.* And let me—that I may.—A.]

Ver. 14. הַשְׁכֵּים, an Infin. abs. used adverbially, as in Jer. xxv. 4; here on account of the pause written with ֵי instead of simple ֵ.

Ver. 15. On the question whether נִשְׁתָּוָה is to be accented and explained as a 3d pers. Nithpael, or whether, with Kimchi, Norzi, and the most recent editors and expositors, we should point the form as Milel [with penultimate accent], and accordingly regard it as perhaps a voluntative Hithpael, with the ָה of motion (therefore "let us compare"), consult Bertheau, Stier and Hitzig on the passage. [Gesen., Röd. (Gesen. *Thes.*, p. 1376, *add.* p. 114), Fuerst, *etc.*, make the form a Nithpael; Bött. (§§ 474, 4, *a* and 1072, θ) agrees with Hitzig in making it a simple Niphal with a different transposition of consonants, and argues at length for this view. Fuerst pronounces the form participial, in opposition to nearly all lexicographers and commentators who make it 2d sing. fem. Gesen. and some others, following Chaldee analogies, rendered, "are to be feared." Rödiger (*ubi supra*) and most others render, "are esteemed alike," or "are alike." Comp. also Ewald, *Lehrb.* § 132, *d*; Green, § 83, *c* (2).—A.]

Ver. 16. יִקְרָא = יִקְרֶה, according to an interchange which is common of א with ה. [In clause *a* we have a singular verb following a plural participle taken distributively as in xxii. 21; xxv. 13, *etc.*—A.]

Ver. 17. יַחַד is best regarded, as Geier, Bertheau and Stier take it, as an Imperf. apoc. Hiphil from חדד = חדה "to sharpen." Ewald, Elster, *etc.*, needlessly take the first יחד in clause *a* as a Hophal: יוּחַד (comp. the Vulg. *exacuitur*) and would have only the second recognized as a Voluntative Hiphil (to be pointed יַחַד or יָחֵד). [Bött. § 1124, β, insists that the Masoretic forms can be regarded as nothing but the ordinary adverb "together," and that the pointing must be changed to יָחַד, יֵחַד, or יָחֵד, יָחֵד. Green, § 140, 1, makes it a simple Kal Imperf. Fuerst regards it as a Niphhal

Digitized by Google

Imperf., no change of vocalization being required, although the more common form would be יָחֵד. Röd. (*Thes.* Gesen., *Ind.* pp. 6, 88) regards the form as an apoc. Hiphil. for the more common יָחֵד, used impersonally, "one sharpens, men sharpen."—A.]

Ver. 20. The parallel passage xv. 11 (see notes on this passage) shows that instead of אֲבַדֹּה (or again instead of אֲבַדּוֹה) we should read with the K'ri אֲבַדּוֹן, or that we should at least assume a transition of this latter form into the former, in the way of lexical decay (as in מְגִדּוֹ for מְגִדּוֹן). [Bött. (§§ 262, *a*; 293) notes this as a tendency in proper nouns, aided perhaps in the case before us by the following liquid.—A.]

Ver. 22. [בָּעֱלִין instead of the more regular בְּעֱלִי, mimetically sharpened in its vocalization at the end of its clause. See Bött., §§ 394, *b*; 49°, 6.—A.]

Ver. 25. [עַשְּׁבוֹת with Dagiesh *dirimens* or separative, indicating the vocal nature of the Sheva. See, *e. g.* Green § 24, *b*; 216, 2, *a*.—A.]

EXEGETICAL.

1. Vers. 1-6. Three pairs of proverbs, directed against self-praise, jealousy and flattery.

Vers. 1, 2. **Boast not thyself of to-morrow**, *i. e.*, "do not throw out with proud assurance high-soaring schemes for the future" (Elster); do not boast of future undertakings as if they had already succeeded and were assured.—**For thou knowest not what a day will bring forth**; *i. e.*, what a day, whether it be today or to-morrow, will bring in new occurrences, is absolutely unknown to thee. Comp. James iv. 13-15; also Horace, *Od.*, iv. 7, 17: *Quis scit an adjiciant hodiernæ crastina summæ Tempora Di superi?*—

["Who knows if they who all our fates control
Will add a morrow to thy brief to-day?"
Theo. Martin's Translation.]

and Seneca, *Thyest.* V. 619: *Nemo tam divos habuit faventes Crastinum ut possit polliceri* [No one has had the gods so favorable that he can promise himself a morrow].—With ver. 2 comp. the German *Eigenlob stinkt*, and Arabic proverbs like "Not as mother says, but as the neighbors say" (Fuerst, *Perlenschnüre*, ii. 8), or "Let thy praise come from thy friend's and kinsman's mouth, not from thine own" (Meidani, p. 467.)

Vers. 3, 4.—**Stone is heavy and sand weighty**, lit., "weight of stone and heaviness of the sand." Hitzig fitly remarks with respect to the genitive combinations of this as well as the succeeding verse ("Cruelty of anger, *etc.*") "The genitive relation holding a figure before our eye instead of developing it in a proposition, possesses nevertheless the value of a combination of predicate and subject." [So K., W., *etc.*, while S. and others make the relation directly that of subject and predicate].—**The fool's wrath**, *i. e.*, probably not: the vexation and anger occasioned in others by the fool (Cocceius, Schultens, Bertheau, [S.], *etc.*), but the annoyance and ill-humor experienced by himself, whether it may have originated in envy, or in a chafing against some correction that he has received, *etc.* Such ill-temper in the fool is a burden, heavier than stone and sand, and that too a burden for himself, but beyond this also for those who must besides suffer under it, whom he makes to feel in common and innocently his ill-will and temper.—**Anger is cruel and wrath is outrageous**, lit., "cruelty of anger and inundation of wrath." With regard to the genitives, compare remarks above on vs. 3, *a*. For the expression "overflowing of wrath" or "excess, outrageousness of wrath," comp. Is. xxx. 28, 30; Dan. ix. 27; xi. 22.—קִנְאָה in clause *b*, often "envy," is plainly "jealousy," as in vi. 34, 35, which passage is here to be compared in general.

Vers. 5, 6. **Better is open rebuke** (open, undisguised censure, honorably expressing its meaning) **than secret love**, *i. e.*, than love which from false consideration dissembles, and does not name to one's neighbor his faults even where it should do so. Compare the ἀληθεύειν ἐν ἀγάπῃ, Eph. iv. 15, as well as the numerous parallels in classic authors (Plautus, *Trinummus*, I. 2, 57; Cicero, *Læl.* 25; Seneca, *Epist.* 25); and Meidani, II. 64: "Love lasts long as the censure lasts," *etc.*—**Faithful** (lit. true, coming from a true disposition) **are the wounds of a friend, but deceitful are the kisses of an enemy.** נַעְתָּרוֹת, from the root עָתַר, is if this be identical with עָשַׁר, *largus fuit*, as is generally assumed, equivalent to "plentiful" (comp. עָשִׁיר), in which case we must think of kisses "liberally bestowed but faithless," or it may be kisses "to be lightly esteemed" (so Gesen., Umbreit, Bertheau, Stier [Fuerst, S., W.]) And yet it corresponds better with the parallelism, as well as with the exegetical tradition (Vulg., *fraudulenta*), to derive from an Arabic root عثر, to stumble (σφάλλειν, *fallere*, therefore *falsus*, false—so Ewald, Elster, *etc.*), or it may be from غدر = עדר in the sense of "to miss"—thus Hitzig,—both of which modes of explanation give the idea "deceptive, crafty, treacherous." With regard to the meaning compare, therefore, chap. xxvi. 23.

2. Vers. 7-14. Eight proverbs in praise of contentment, of friendship, prudence, *etc.*

Ver. 7. **A satisfied soul loatheth honeycomb.** The verb literally means "tramples, treads under feet," comp. Dan. vii. 19; Judg. v. 21.—With clause *b* compare the German proverb "Hunger is the best cook;" and also Ecclesiast. iv. 2.

Ver. 8. **So is a man that roameth far from his dwelling-place.** As the preceding proverb is directed against a want of contentment in the department of food and drink, so is this against weariness of one's own home, against adventurous wandering impulses, and a restless roving without quiet domestic tastes. Comp. Ecclesiast. xxix. 28, 29; xxxvi. 28.

Ver. 9. With clause *a* compare Ps. civ. 15;

Digitized by Google

cxxxiii. 2.—**But the sweetness of a friend is better than one's own counsel.** The "sweetness" of the friend is according to xvi. 21 doubtless sweetness of the lips, the pleasing, agreeable discourse of the friend (lit. "of his friend;" the suffix stands indefinitely, with reference *i. e.* to every friend that a man really has; here with especial reference to the possessor of the נֶפֶשׁ). See also the critical notes. The מֵעֲצַת is best taken in the sense of comparison (with JARCHI, LEVI, COCCEIUS, UMBREIT, STIER): "better than counsel of the soul," *i. e.*, better than one's own counsel, better than that prudence which will help itself and relies purely on its own resources (comp. xxviii. 26). EWALD, ELSTER (in like manner also LUTHER, GEIER, DE WETTE [K., N.], *etc.*,) render: "The sweetness of the friend springeth from (faithful) counsel of soul," which is understood as describing the genuineness and the hearty honesty of the friend's disposition. BERTHEAU gives a similar idea, except that he supplies in *b* from *a* the predicate with its object: "The sweetness of a friend from sincere counsel maketh glad the heart" (?); [this is very nearly the conception of the E. V., H., S., M.]. HITZIG following the καταῤῥήγνυται δὲ ὑπὸ συμπτωμάτων ἡ ψυχή of the LXX, amends so as to read: "but the soul is rent with cares." [See critical notes for still other expositions of the phrase.]

Ver. 10. **Thine own friend and thy father's friend forsake not.** Whether one read with the K'ri וְרֵעַ or with the K'thibh the *stat. constr.* of the emphatic form [or according to others the primitive form—see critical notes], in any event together with the friend of the person addressed "his father's friend" is also named, but as an identical person with the former, who, for that reason, has a value proportionally greater, and may so much the less be neglected, because he is as it were an heirloom of the family of long tried fidelity and goodness.—**And into thy brother's house enter not in the day of thy calamity.** HITZIG, who explains the three clauses of this verse as originally separate propositions, only "afterward forced together," fails to see a logical connection as well between *a* and *b* as between *b* and *c*. This is in fact in the highest degree arbitrary, for the common aim of the three members: to emphasize the great value of true friendship and its pre-eminence in comparison with a merely external relationship of blood, comes out to view as clearly as possible. The "near" neighbor is he who keeps himself near as one dispensing counsel and help to the distressed, just as the "far off" brother is he who, on account of his unloving disposition, keeps at a distance from the same. [Our commentators have in general agreed substantially with this conception of the scope of the verse.—A.].

Ver. 11. **Be wise, my son, and make my heart glad,** *etc.* Evidently an admonition of a fatherly teacher of wisdom addressed to his pupil (comp. i. 8 sq.; xxii. 21; xxiii. 15),—perhaps of the same one to whom the wise counsel of the preceding verse in regard to conduct toward friends likewise belonged.—**That I may know how to give an answer to him that reproacheth me** (literally, "and so will I then return a word to my reviler"), *i. e.*, in order that I, pointing to thy wise and exemplary conduct, may be able to stop the mouth of him who reviles me, the responsible teacher. Comp. Ps. cxix. 42; also cxxvii. 5; Ecclesiast. xxx. 2 sq.

Ver. 12. In almost literal accordance with xxii. 3.

Ver. 13. Almost exactly like xx. 16 (comp. notes on this passage.)

Ver. 14. **He that blesseth his friend with a loud voice early in the morning.** These words are directed against a friend who is flattering and profuse in compliment, but inwardly insincere; who, by his congratulations, hasty, and offered with boisterous ostentation, brings, instead of a real blessing to his friend, only a curse upon his house, at least in the general judgment of the people. For of them we must think in clause *b* as those who are to "reckon." For this last verb and its construction, "reckoning something to some one," comp. Gen. xv. 6. [This insincere and untimely praise may be accredited to its giver as no better than a curse in his intention, or more positively it may be regarded as veiling an evil intent, and so threatening an actual curse to him who is its object.—A.]

3. Vers. 15, 16. Two maxims concerning a contentious woman.—**A continual dropping in a very rainy day** (according to the Arabic סַגְרִיר denotes "a rain poured as if out of buckets," and so "a pouring rain;" moreover the word occurs only here), **and a contentious woman are alike.** Like this, only more concise, is chap. xix. 13, *b*. [The peculiar force of this comparison to one who has been in the rainy season under the flat earthy roofs of Oriental houses, is commented on and illustrated, *e. g.*, in HACKETT's *Scripture Illustrations*, p. 85, and THOMSON's *Land and Book*, I. 453. A.]—**He that will restrain her restraineth the wind** (צָפַן literally "to shut out, dam up, confine"), **and his right hand graspeth after oil,** *i. e.*, it grasps after something, encounters an object, seeks to retain something that is necessarily continually eluding it. [The idea of hiding her disagreeable and vexatious disposition from the view of others, which is expressed by the E. V., H., W., in both clauses, and by N. and M. in the second, is less appropriate and forcible than that given in the version of our author, K., S., *etc.*—A.]

4. Vers. 17–22. Six proverbs against haughtiness, selfishness, a greedy eye, self-praise and folly.—**Iron sharpeneth iron,** lit. iron to iron maketh sharp, or according to others, "iron is made sharp by iron,"—see critical notes]. **So doth a man sharpen the face of his friend.** Whether we render פְּנֵי by "face, look," or (as HITZIG maintains) by "edge, *acies ingenii*, the mental keenness," in either case the meaning is not: "One enrages, provokes the other" (STIER and in like manner BERTHEAU), but: One stimulates the other, polishes himself by mutual spiritual contact and friction with his fellow, contributes by such an interchange of one's own peculiarities with those of his fellow to the spiritual development of both (compare especially ELSTER and HITZIG on the passage). ["Conference hath incredible profit in all sciences," observes TRAPP. "A man by himself," says MUFFET, "is no man,

Digitized by Google

he is dull, he is very blunt: but if his fellow come and quicken him by his presence, speech, and example, he is so whetted on by this means that he is much more comfortable, skilful, and better than he was when he was alone." So most of our commentators, while STUART, and NOYES with a qualification, would find the idea of provocation, not as though anger were even indirectly commended, but "if men must enter into contest, let the antagonists be worthy of the strife" (S.); an exposition far weaker as well as more unnatural than the ordinary one.—A.].

Ver. 18. With the general proposition in *a* comp. xii. 11; xxviii. 19.—**And he that hath regard to his master is honored**. The honor which the master (*i. e.*, any master whatever, and not God especially, the master of all, as STIER holds) confers upon his faithful servant resembles the fruit which the fig tree yields to the proprietor or tenant who carefully cultivates it. "To regard one," *colere aliquem*, as in Ps. xxxi. 7; Hos. iv. 10.

Ver. 19. **As** (in) **water face** (answereth) **to face, so the heart of man to man.** כַּמַּיִם, an accusative of place: "as in water," EWALD, § 221. The meaning will be like that of ver. 17, somewhat such as this: "As the mirror of the water reflects the likeness of one's own face, so one's heart is mirrored in that of his fellow, if one only has courage and penetration enough to look deeply into this" (EWALD; comp. STIER and BERTHEAU). There is contained in this at the same time an admonition to the wise testing and examination both of one's own heart and that of our fellow-men; or, the recommendation of a comprehensive knowledge of men, to be gained by thorough knowledge of one's self. The Vulgate already gives essentially the right idea: "*Quomodo in aquis resplendent vultus respicientium, sic corda hominum manifesta sunt prudentibus*;" while several other ancient expositors, whom ELSTER to some extent follows, find expressed in the passage a relation too exclusively ethical, *viz.*, that of arousing by love a reciprocal love, or that of the practical maxim, "*Si vis amari, ama*" ["Love if you would be loved"].—HITZIG thinks that clause *a* כְּמוּם must be the reading instead of כַּמַּיִם: "What a mole on the face is to the face, that is man's heart to man," *viz.*, his disfiguring mole, his dark spot, his *partie honteuse* in the sense of Gen. viii. 21 (?). [Among our English expositors the mirror and the mirrored object have been somewhat variously understood; some retain while others dismiss the specific idea of reflection that is suggested by clause *a*. MUFFET and HOLDEN, *e. g.*, make a man's own heart the mirror in which he may truly know himself; WORDSW. makes the mirror the hearts of others on whom we act; while the great majority make the reflected object the oneness, especially the moral oneness of human nature, as discoverable from any heart into which we may look (so *e. g.*, BP. HALL, TRAPP, LAWSON, BRIDGES, S. and M.) —A.].

Ver. 20. **Hell and destruction are never full** [*i. e.*, not the world of the lost, but the world of the dead]. The meaning of clause *b* as indicated by this parallel in *a* cannot be doubtful. It relates to the really demoniacal insatiableness of human passion, especially the "lust of the eyes;" comp. 1 John ii. 16; James iii. 6; and in particular Prov. xxx. 16; Eccles. i. 8.

Ver. 21. With *a* compare the literally identical language in chap. xvii. 3 *a*.—**But man according to his glorying**, *i. e.*, one is judged according to the standard of that of which he makes his boast (the noun to be taken not in a subjective, but in an objective sense, of the object of one's glorying). If his boast is of praiseworthy things, then he is recognized as a strong, true man, *etc.*; if he glories in trivial or even of evil things, he is abhorred; comp. above ver. 2. Thus EWALD, BERTHEAU, HITZIG, [K.], while the majority (the LXX, Vulg., LUTHER, *etc.*, also UMBREIT, STIER, ELSTER, *etc.*), translate the second clause: "so is man for the mouth of his praise," *i. e.*, for the mouth of the one that praises him [testing the nature and worth of the praise that is bestowed]—to which the figure in clause *a* can be made to correspond only by a considerably forced interpretation. [Here again among the English expositors who adopt this general idea, making the praise objective, there is diversity in carrying out the details. Is man the crucible or is he the object tested? N. and W. take the former view, according to which man tests or should test with careful discrimination the praise bestowed upon him; H., S. and M. take the other view, by which the praise is represented as testing him and disclosing his real character in the effects which it produces upon him.—A.].

Ver. 22. **Though thou bruise a fool in a mortar among grain** ("grains of wheat;" the word is used only here and in 2 Sam. xvii. 19), **with a pestle**, *etc.* The meaning of this proverb, which has at least its humorous side, is plain; lack of reason is to such a degree the very substance of the fool, is so intertwined in his inward and outward nature, that one might divide him into atoms without eradicating thereby this fundamental character of his. This idea is not so clearly connected with the preceding verse by its substance as by the similarity of the figures employed in the two (the crucible and the mortar); comp. HITZIG on the passage.

5. Vers. 23-27. Admonition to a prudent and frugal economy in connection with agricultural possessions.—**Thou shalt know well** (Z. "make thyself well acquainted with") **the face of thy sheep.** "The look of the sheep" (comp. Gen. xxx. 40), *i. e.*, its condition and thrift.

Ver. 24. **For riches are not forever**—*viz.*, the supply of subsistence, on the abundant presence of which the good appearance of the flock depends above all things else.—**And doth the crown endure forevermore?** The question introduced by this interrogative (וְאִם) expresses the idea of a very strong negation, standing as a climax to the preceding: and even the crown, the royal diadem, has no perpetual existence. The נֵזֶר seems not to designate the metal of itself that composes the king's crown, but the kingly dignity and authority represented by it; the expression "from generation to generation" plainly indicates this. HITZIG's rendering is as trivial as it is contrary to the *usus loquendi*: that נֵזֶר means "grass, fodder" (because it sometimes signifies the hair of the head, and may therefore

Digitized by Google

designate the herbage as a hairlike ornament to the earth!).

Ver. 25. **The grass disappeareth,** *etc.;* a reason for the admonition contained in the preceding verse, that one should be intent upon laying up ample supplies of nourishment for the flocks. The discourse passes over in vers. 25-27 to a richly diversified description of the beauty and abundance of rural nature, reminding us of Ps. lxv. 10-14, but in its present connection having this aim,—to show how God's creation liberally rewards the labor bestowed upon it by the active and industrious landlord. Neither this concluding picture, nor the entire passage from ver. 23 onward can be interpreted in some allegorical way (with various ancient expositors, SCHULTENS and STIER), and be applied to the conduct of the spiritual, pastoral office of the teacher of wisdom. As the utmost that is admissible this conception may have a place under certain conditions in the practical and homiletic treatment of the passage. [WORDSW. characteristically makes much of the secondary import of these verses.—A.].

Ver. 26. **And goats (as) price for the field;** *i. e.*, goats of such value that for each one a piece of arable land might be exchanged.

Ver. 27. **Abundance also of goat's milk . . . for subsistence for thy maidens.** וְחַיִּים (with which we must repeat לְ from the preceding) "and life" is here equivalent to "substance, nourishment." Female servants, maidens, waiting women, were wanting in no large household among the Hebrews, not even in the royal palace and the temple; comp. 2 Sam. iv. 6; 1 Sam. ii. 22 sq. Here we must naturally think first of shepherdesses, milkmaids, *etc.*

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL, HOMILETIC AND PRACTICAL.

Modesty, contentment and prudence are the central ideas about which we may group the practical instructions of the section just expounded, if not in all their items at least in large measure. Especially may we throw under these categories what is said of the necessity of avoiding all vain self-praise, and of boasting in an inconsiderate extravagant way neither of our own prosperity nor of our neighbor's (vers. 1, 2, 14, 21); in like manner that which relates to the duty of moderation in ill temper and jealousy, in sensual enjoyments, in love of restless wandering and of sight-seeing (vers. 3, 4, 7, 8, 20); and not less, finally, the admonition which recurs in manifold transformations to a general prudence in life, as it should be exhibited in social and business intercourse with others, and in the diligent discharge of the domestic duties of one's calling (vers. 11, 18, 17-19, 23-27). If so inclined we might reckon among these commendations of an all-embracing practical wisdom even the warning against the contentiousness of a bad woman (ver. 15, 16), as well as the encomiums upon a genuine, unfeigned friendship, in vers. 5, 6, 9, 10; and in these especially, and above all in the command (ver. 10): to regard the love of a true friend more highly than the bonds of relationship of blood,—an injunction which reminds us of expressions in the New Testament, such as Matth. x. 37; xii. 48-50, we might see the very climax, and the main theme of the discourse of wisdom which constitutes this chapter. Over against this counsel, to give to the love of a true friend the preference above all vain passions and selfish interests, we have presented in a significant way the evidence which establishes the sad truth, that the fool is not disposed at any price to let go his selfish, vain, arrogant nature (ver. 22), in connection with which fact allusion is made to the natural corruption of human hearts in general and to the necessity for their being given up to the delivering and renewing influences of divine grace (comp. ver. 11).

Homily on the chapter as a whole: "Godliness with contentment is great gain" (1 Tim. vi. 6).—Or, boast neither of thy prosperity, nor of thy deeds, nor of any earthly and human advantages whatsoever, but only of the Lord (1 Cor. i. 31).—STÖCKER: Of conceit and vain presumption as a first and main hinderance to the progress of true wisdom (comp. besides comments on chapters xxviii. and xxix).—*Calwer Handbuch:* Of the means of attaining true honor.

Ver. 1-6. MELANCHTHON (on verse 1): That which is necessary and first demanded by our duty we must do before all else, conscientiously, and with appeals for divine help, lest in reliance upon our own strength or on foolish hopes we undertake needless and futile things.—STARKE: He walks the more cautiously who always considers that to-day may be the day of his death (James iv. 13 sq.; Ecclesiast. vii. 40).—Comp. the New Year's Sermon by RÖHR (*Sonntagsfeier*, 1844, No. 15): "The high and weighty import that each year of life has for us."—[J. EDWARDS: Not depending on another day, is a different thing from concluding that we shall not live another day. We ought not to behave ourselves in any respect as though we depended on another day.—ARNOT: This proverb contains only the negative side of the precept; but it is made hollow for the very purpose of holding the positive promise in its bosom. The Old Testament sweeps away the wide-spread indurated error; the New Testament then deposits its saving truth upon the spot.—A. FULLER (on verse 2): A vain man speaks well of himself; and Paul speaks well of himself. The *motive* in the one case is desire of applause; in the other justice to an injured character, and to the Gospel which suffered in his reproaches.—BP. HOPKINS: The tongue is of itself very apt to be lavish when it hath so sweet and pleasing a theme as a man's own praise].—*Tübingen Bible:* Self-praise is a sign of great pride, and must be in the highest degree offensive to the wise man when he has to hear it.—GEIER (on verses 3, 4): If even the pious man may easily transgress in his anger, how much more easily the ungodly!—LANGE (on vers. 5, 6): He who truly loves his neighbor is bound, when the occasion presents itself, to persuade, admonish and warn him; Ps. cxli. 5; Gal. vi. 1.—WOHLFARTH (on vers. 5, 6, 9, 10): Moral perfection the highest aim and blessing of true friendship.—VON GERLACH: A rebuke before the whole world is better than a love that proves itself by nothing, that only flatters in connection with a neighbor's faults.—[LORD

Digitized by Google

BACON: This proverb rebukes the mistaken kindness of friends who do not use the privilege of friendship freely and boldly to admonish their friends as well of their errors as their dangers.]

Ver. 8 sq. MELANCTHON (on ver. 8): Solomon here warns against our forsaking our lawful calling from weariness; Eph. iv. 1; 1 Cor. vii. 20.—LUTHER (marginal comment on ver. 8): Let no assault drive thee from thy calling; hold fast, and God will make thee prosper.—LANGE: By discontent with one's position and calling one only doubles his need, and sins grossly against God's holy providence.—[MUFFET: The wandering person is hated and despised by all; none honoreth his kindred, none regardeth his beauty, none careth for him, and none feareth to hurt him.—JOHN HOWE (on ver. 10): If it be an indecency, and uncomeliness, and a very unfit thing, that is, contrary to the precept of studying whatsoever is lovely, and thinking of those things, to forsake my friend and my father's friend, how much more horrid must it be to forsake my God and my father's God!]—STARKE (on vers. 9, 10): God is the best of all friends; strive with great care, that thou mayest obtain God's favor and friendship, and thou mayest never lose them.—VON GERLACH: Union of spirit with an old family friend from the father down is to be much preferred to mere relationship of blood.—[T. ADAMS (on ver. 12): The fool goes, he runs, he flies; as if God that rides upon the wings of the wind should not overtake him. Haste might be good if the way were good, and good speed added to it, but this is the shortest way out of the way. He need not run fast: the fool may come soon enough to that place from whence he must never return].

Ver. 14. sq. LUTHER (marginal comment on ver. 14): He who reproves much praises, and he who praises much censures; for they are not believed because they go too far.—*Tübingen Bible:* Too much praised is half censured. Trust not the flatterer who praises thee to excess.—[BP. HOPKINS: Let all thy reproofs be given as secretly and privately as thou canst; otherwise thou wilt seem not so much to aim at thy brother's reformation, as at his shame and confusion.—LORD BACON: Moderate praise used with opportunity, and not vulgar, is that which doeth the good.—ARNOT (on ver. 17): One half of the human faculties are framed for maintaining intercourse with men, and one half of the divine law is occupied with rules for regulating it].—MELANCTHON: Let us recognize our weakness, and see that the individual man is ignorant of much, errs and stumbles, and . . . . that God has furnished us men with the power of speech chiefly for this, that one may befriend another with counsel and instruction.—ZELTNER: The pious should arouse one another, and stimulate to all good works (Heb. x. 24), and that too in all circumstances.—GEIER (on ver. 18): Faithful labor and diligence find at length their rich reward—if not from men, at least from God; Heb. vi. 10.

Ver. 19 sq. LUTHER (marginal comment on ver. 19): As the outline in water trembles and is uncertain, so also are hearts. The lesson is: Trust not!—[BP. HOPKINS: In the world we see our own hearts unbowelled; and there we can learn what ourselves are at the cost of other men's sins].—LUTHER (on ver. 21): He who loves to hear himself praised is easily deceived: for he proves thereby that he is a reckless man who values his honor above all right.—STARKE (on ver. 21): If thou art praised, let it serve thee as a test, a humiliation, and a profit.—LANGE (on ver. 22): The urging and chastisement of the law makes no one pious, and does not change the heart. The power of the Gospel must change and renew the hard heart.—VON GERLACH: No outward cure helps at all where the inward part is obstinately corrupt.

Vers. 23-27. STARKE: Let every one labor diligently in his calling, let him indeed bring everything to counsel, and be thoroughly systematic in his actions.—GEIER: If it be important carefully to guard and to cherish silly sheep, oh, how much more Christ's sheep, the souls which He has redeemed with His precious blood! Acts xx. 28.—WOHLFARTH: The husbandman's prosperity (a sermon for a harvest thanksgiving).—VON GERLACH: To persevere is as needful as to acquire in every kind of possession.—[LAWSON: God's bounty is a great encouragement to our industry].

---

c) Against unscrupulous, unlawful dealing (especially of the rich with the poor).

CHAP. XXVIII.

1 The wicked flee when no man pursueth,
but the righteous are bold as a lion.
2 In the rebellion of a land its princes become many,
but through wise, prudent men one (the prince) continueth long.
3 A man who is poor and oppresseth the lowly
is (like) a rain flooding and (bringing) no food.
4 They that forsake the law praise the wicked,
but they that keep the law contend with them.

Digitized by Google

5 Evil men understand not judgment,
but they that seek Jehovah understand all.
6 Better (is) a poor man that walketh in his uprightness,
than he that walketh in crooked ways and is rich.
7 He that keepeth the law is a wise son,
but the companion of profligates causeth his father shame.
8 He that increaseth his wealth by interest and usury
gathereth it for one that pitieth the poor.
9 He that turneth away his ear from hearing the law,
even his prayer is an abomination.
10 He that leadeth the righteous astray in an evil way,
in his own pit shall he fall;
but the upright shall inherit good.
11 The rich man thinketh himself wise,
but a poor man that hath understanding searcheth him out.
12 When righteous men exult there is great glory,
but when wicked men arise the people hide themselves.
13 He that hideth his sins shall not prosper,
but he that confesseth and forsaketh them shall find mercy.
14 Happy is the man that feareth always;
but he that hardeneth his heart shall fall into evil.
15 A roaring lion and a ravening bear
is a wicked ruler over a poor people.
16 O prince, poor in understanding and abounding in oppressions;
he that hateth unjust gain shall prolong his days!
17 A man laden with the blood of a soul
fleeth to the pit; let them not detain him!
18 He that walketh uprightly shall be delivered;
but he that walketh in crooked ways shall fall suddenly.
19 He that tilleth his land shall be satisfied with bread,
but he that followeth vanity shall have poverty enough.
20 A faithful man aboundeth in blessings;
but he that hasteth to be rich shall not go unpunished.
21 To have respect of persons is not good,
and (yet) for a piece of bread (many) a man will transgress.
22 He that hath an evil eye hasteth after riches,
and knoweth not that want shall come upon him.
23 He that reproveth a man shall afterward find favor
more than he that flattereth with his tongue.
24 He that robbeth his father and his mother,
and saith it is no wrong,
he is companion to one that destroyeth.
25 He that is of a covetous heart stirreth up strife,
but he that trusteth in Jehovah shall be richly rewarded.
26 He that trusteth in his own heart is a fool,
but he that walketh in wisdom, shall be delivered.
27 He that giveth to the poor (suffereth) no want,
but he that covereth his eyes hath abundance of curses.
28 When wicked men rise men hide themselves,
but when they perish the righteous increase.

GRAMMATICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 2. פשע might perhaps be more correctly read as an Infinitive: בְּפְשֹׁעַ—Comp. Hitzig on this passage. As the words of the original Hebrew now stand, we can supply a subject for יַאֲרִיךְ only the singular שַׂר ("the true prince"); in like manner the בְ in וּבְאָדָם must be taken in the sense of בִּהְיוֹת "when there is at hand;" the כֵּן however must be taken as an introduction to the concluding clause, like our "then" or "so." In all this there is indeed the difficulty remaining that the participles מֵבִין and יֹדֵעַ stand side by side without a copula—an anomaly that is hardly removed by referring to chap. xxii. 4 (Bertheau). And yet the construction thus brought out is, in spite of the manifold

anomalies which it involves, after all better than, *e. g.* that of UMBREIT, who takes כֵּן as a substantive in the sense of "right" as dependent on יֹדֵעַ,—or than HITZIG's violent emendation (יָדַעְךָ מָדוֹן instead of יֹדֵעַ כֵּן יַאֲרִיךְ), the meaning resulting from which "but through a man of understanding contention ceases," does not agree very well with the context. [The R. V. takes כֵּן as a noun: "the state thereof," *etc.* so H. and M. (the stability'). N. without this specific rendering reaches the same result by finding for the verb "shall prolong its days, or endure" the subject "it" (the state) suggested in clause *a*. S. follows UMBREIT. BÖTT. (§ 935, β) regards the verb as furnishing an example of what he calls "concrete impersonals," having a general subject "one," a construction not uncommon where reference is made to public offices or functions. This reaches Z's. result by a different path.—A.]

Ver. 17.—[The participle עָשֻׁק BÖTT. prefers an account of its peculiar vocalization to regard as a mutilated Pual part., deprived of its initial מְ, and would therefore point עֻשָּׁק; so xxv. 11, *etc.* See § 994, 6, 10.—A.]

Ver. 18.—נֶעְקַשׁ דְּרָכַיִם is equivalent to עִקֵּשׁ דְּרָכַיִם in ver. 6.

Ver. 23.—אַחֲרַי a somewhat stronger form in its vowel elements than אַחֲרֵי, used here as אַחַר is elsewhere.

EXEGETICAL.

1. Vers. 1–5. Of the general contrast between the righteous and the ungodly (unscrupulous transgressors, men of violence).—**The wicked flee when no man pursueth.** "The wicked" (singular) is on the ground of its collective, or more exactly its distributive meaning, subject of a plural verb; compare similar constructions, *κατὰ σύνεσιν*: Job viii. 19; Isa. xvi. 4; and also below, ver. 4 of the present chapter; 1 Tim. ii. 15 (*γυνή—ἐὰν μείνωσιν*), *etc.* [See EWALD *Lehrb.* § 309, *a*, and other grammars].—**But the righteous are bold as a lion.** יִבְטָח is to be explained as a relative clause and referred to the preceding "as a lion"—"which is confident, rests quietly" in the consciousness of its superior strength and the security which results from it, see the same figure in Gen. xlix. 9. [This seems to be needlessly artificial; according to a common Hebrew construction the verb may be a distributive singular after a plural, "the righteous." See *e. g.* GREEN, § 275, 6.—A.]

Ver. 2. **In the rebellion of a land its princes become many.** For this use of "transgression" in the sense of "rebellion, revolt," comp. the verb employed in this sense in 2 Kings i. 1; also Ex. xxiii. 21, *etc.* The allusion is plainly to the uprising of many petty chiefs or tyrants, or many pretenders to the throne, or usurpers opposing each other, in lands which, through revolt from the lawfully reigning house, have fallen a prey to political anarchy, as *e. g.* the Kingdom of Israel, especially in the period after Jeroboam II.,—to which the author of the proverb now under consideration might very well have had special reference. [On account of the form of clause *b* we prefer, with KAMPH., to understand the allusion to be to a rapid succession of half established kings, rather than to a number of competing claimants. THOMSON, *Land and Book*, I., 498, cites an Arabic proverb: "May Allah multiply your sheikhs!" as embodying in its intense malediction a constant Oriental experience of fearful calamity. It is only incidentally illustrative of the proverb before us.—A.]—**But through wise, prudent men he** (the prince) **continueth long.** [See Critical notes.]

Ver. 3. **A man who is poor and oppresseth the poor.** We are to think of some magistrate who is originally poor, an upstart, who seeks to enrich himself rapidly by oppression of his subjects. This man is in clause *b* very appropriately described as a "rain" that floods the sowed field or the fruitful district, and thus destroys the prosperous condition of the crops. [Here again, and more appropriately, THOMSON (*ubi supra*) illustrates, both from natural and political experiences common in the East, the impressiveness of this proverb to an Oriental mind.—A.]

Ver. 4. **They that forsake the law praise the wicked,** *i. e.* for his success; comp. Ps. xlix. 12, 19; lxxiii. 8, 10, 12.—**But they that keep the law** (xxix. 18) **contend with him;** lit., "with them;" comp. remarks above on ver. 1. For this verb, "to contend or dispute," comp. Jer. l. 24; Dan. xi. 10, *etc.*

Ver. 5. **Evil men** (lit., "men of evil," comp. remarks on vi. 23) **do not understand judgment;** their wickedness darkens their understanding likewise, which is especially the faculty for distinguishing between good and evil; comp. chap. xxix. 7. In contrast with them "they who seek God understand everything," *i. e.* everything that relates to the investigation and determination of right; comp. Eccles. viii. 5.

2. Vers. 6–12. Against wanton oppression of the poor by the rich.—With ver. 6 compare the quite similar proverb chap. xix. 1.—**Than he that walketh in crooked ways;** lit., "than one who is crooked in the two ways," or, "than one who is perverse in a double way" (the dual of the noun is used here as in ver. 18 [see GREEN, *Gram.* § 208, 8]), *i. e.* one who unskilfully and waywardly passes from one way to another, one who, with divided heart, stands midway between the right path and the bypath of immorality; comp. Ecclesiast. ii. 12; James i. 6.

Ver. 7. With clause *a* compare x. 1; xxix. 3.—**But the companion of profligates.** For the verb רָעָה, to cherish, to cultivate intercourse with some one, comp. xiii. 20. For the term "profligate or waster," comp. xxiii. 21.

Ver. 8. **He that increaseth his wealth by interest and usury.** The "interest" and "usury" are so distinguished according to Lev. xxv. 36, 37, that the former denotes the annual revenue of a sum of money loaned out, the latter an exaction in other things, especially in natural products. The former is then *fœnus pecuniarium*, the latter *fœnus naturale sive reale*. [Here again Orientals, ancient and modern, have a peculiarly deep and painful experience of the enormities of usury.—A.]—**He gathereth it for one that pitieth the poor,** *i. e.* for an heir who will at length show himself more liberal and compassionate toward the poor; comp. xiii. 22, and also Job xxvii. 16, 17. MERCERUS, EWALD, BERTHEAU,

Digitized by Google

ELSTER take the לְחוֹנֵן as an Infinitive of the intensive form: "*ad largiendum pauperibus*," for bestowal upon the poor, to show himself merciful to the poor. But such an involuntary giving is a harsh idea, difficult to realize; and the meaning, "to bestow, *largiri*," חנן has elsewhere only in the Kal conj., the participle of which corresponds best with the general context before us.

Ver. 9. Comp. xv. 8; and with clause *a* in particular Isa. xiii. 15.

Ver. 10. **He that leadeth the righteous astray in an evil way.** The "evil way" is unquestionably a way of sin and ungodliness, whether the רָע be taken as a neuter substantive in the genitive (as in ver. 5; vi. 24), or, which is perhaps to be preferred here, as an adjective. With clause *b* compare xxvi. 27; with *c*, ii. 21. The "pit" in *b* is naturally the way of sin into which one betrays the upright, not as it is in itself, but in its ruinous issues to which he is finally brought. Comp. chap. xi. 6, 8.

Ver. 11. With *a* compare xxvi. 16.—**But a poor man that hath understanding searcheth him out**; *i. e.* he sees through him, and accordingly knows his weaknesses, and therefore outstrips him in the struggle for true prosperity in life.

Ver. 12. **When righteous men exult** (triumph). עֲלֹץ, lit., "to rejoice," here expresses the idea of the victory of the good cause over its opposers, in which victory "all the people" (according to xxix. 2) sympathize with great exultation. HITZIG's alteration is unnecessary (בַּעֲלֹץ into בְּחָלֵץ, suggested by the διὰ βοήθειαν of the LXX): "when righteous men are delivered."—**But when wicked men rise**, come up, attain to power. Compare, with respect to this as well as the people's anxious "hiding themselves," ver. 28.

3. Vers. 13–18. Against the secret service of sin, hardening of the heart, tyranny, and thirst for blood.—With ver. 13 comp. Ps. xxxii. 1-5.

Ver. 14. **Happy is the man that feareth always**, *i. e.* he who lives in a holy dread of transgressing the will of God by sins of any kind whatsoever; comp. 2 Cor. v. 11: Phil. ii. 12, *etc.* The antithesis to this man "who feareth always" is the "confident," the carnally presumptuous, hardened in the service of sin; ver. 26 and also chap. xvi. 14.—With *b* comp. Ps. xcv. 8; Prov. xvii. 20.

Ver. 15. **A roaring lion and a ravening bear.** שׁוֹקֵק the ancient translators (LXX: διψῶν; Vulg. *esuriens*, *etc.*), already give with a substantial correctness, when they interpret it of the raging hunger or the blood-thirstiness of the bear: comp. Isa. xxix. 8; Ps. cvii 9. Not so well BERTHEAU and ELSTER (following KIMCHI, LEVI, COCCEIUS, *etc.*, [GESEN., FUERST, E. V., H., S., while LUTHER, DE W., K., N., M., RÖD., *etc.*, agree with our author]): "a roaming, ranging bear,"—for which rendering neither Joel ii. 9 nor Isa. xxiii. 4 can be adduced as decisive supports.

Ver. 16. **O prince poor in understanding** (lit., in "discernments") **and abounding in oppression.** This conception of the first clause as an animated appeal to a tyrant (EWALD, BERTHEAU, ELSTER, *etc.*), seems to correspond better with the second clause than HITZIG's view, according to which clause *a* is a nominative absolute, not to be resumed by a suffix in *b*, or than STIER's still more forced translation: "A prince who lacks understanding—so much more does he practice oppression," *etc.* [LUTHER, E. V., DE W., H., N., M. make the general relation of the clauses antithetic, each clause having its normal subject and predicate, although H., *e. g.*, admits the want of precision in the antithesis. K. agrees with HITZIG's abrupt sundering of the clauses; while S. makes the first a synecdochical clause, "as to a prince," *etc.* Our author's rendering if animated is certainly unusual.—A.]—**He that hateth unjust gain shall prolong his days.** For the generalizing plural שֹׂנְאֵי, which stands here quite as appropriately as *e. g.* iii. 18; xxvii. 16, the K'ri unnecessarily calls for the singular שֹׂנֵא. [So BÖTT., § 702, ε].

Ver. 17. **A man laden with the blood of a soul.** For this participle, "burdened, loaded" (with the sense of guilt), comp. Isa. xxxviii. 14. [The E. V. loses the passive form and force of the expression; so LUTHER and H.; while DE W., K., N., S., M., W. agree with Z.—A.]—**Fleeth to the pit**, is restless and a fugitive (like Cain, Gen. iv. 14), even to the terrible destruction toward which he is hastening by God's righteous decrees, and from which no human exertion is able to hold him back. Hence the warning exclamation at the end: "let no one detain him," *i. e.* let no one attempt the impossible, after all to recover him who is irrecoverably lost!

Ver. 18 forms an antithesis to the preceding verse, cast in a somewhat general form.—**He that walketh uprightly** (comp. Ps. xv. 2; Mic. ii. 7) **shall be delivered, but he that walketh in crooked ways shall fall suddenly.** Comp. "the perverse in a double way," in ver. 6. The "suddenly, at once," points to the fact that the one or the other of the two perverse ways which the ungodly alternately pursues, must bring him at last to ruin.

4. Vers. 19-28. Various warnings and cautions, directed mainly against avarice and violence.—With ver. 19 comp. xii. 11.— . . . . **is surfeited with poverty.** A stronger and more direct antithesis to *a* than the "is void of understanding" in xii. 11 *b*.

Ver. 20. **A faithful man aboundeth in blessings.** For the "man of fidelities," comp. the similar expression in chap. xx. 6; also 2 Kings xii. 16; xxii. 7, *etc.*—**But he that hasteth to be rich**, naturally, in unfaithful, dishonorable ways. Comp. xx. 21; xxi. 5; and for the concluding phrase, iv. 29.

Ver. 21. With *a* compare the somewhat more complete expression, xxiv. 23.—**And** (yet) **even for a piece of bread** (many) **a man will transgress.** The morsel of bread (1 Sam. ii. 36) probably stands here not as an example of a peculiarly insignificant bribe, but as the concrete designation of a trifle, a very slight value or advantage of any sort. Comp. A. GELLIUS, *Noct. Att.* I., 15, where CATO says in proverbial phrase of the tribune Cælius, "*frusto*

Digitized by Google

panis conduci potest, vel ut taceat, vel ut loquatur" [with a crust of bread he can be hired either to keep silence or to speak].

Ver. 22. **He that hath a covetous eye hasteth after riches**, lit., "with an evil eye," and therefore the envious; comp. xxiii. 6. For the idea of hastening after riches comp. xx. 21.—**And knoweth not that want shall come upon him.**—Instead of חֶסֶר "want" (comp. Job xxx. 3 and a kindred term in Eccles. i. 15) the LXX read חֶסֶד (so likewise the *Edit. Bomberg.*, 1525, and the *Plantin.*, 1566). If this reading were original, then we must undoubtedly render in accordance with chap. xiv. 34; xxv. 10; by "shame, reproach." Yet the Masoretic reading also gives a good sense, as a comparison of vi. 11; xxiii. 5, and other passages that refer to the vanity and perishableness of riches teaches.

Ver. 23. **He that reproveth a man findeth afterward more favor**, *etc.*—"Later, afterward," in the general sense, and not possibly with ABEN EZRA, J. H. MICHAELIS, to be taken in the sense of "after me, *i. e.*, according to my precepts." With the flattering "smoothness of the tongue" in *b* compare xxix. 5; Ps. v. 10; cxl. 4; Rom. iii. 13.

Ver. 24. **He that robbeth his father and his mother.**—Comp. xix. 26; also Mal. i. 8; Mark vii. 11 sq.; and for the expression "companion of a destroyer" in clause *c*, chapter xviii. 9.

Ver. 25. **The covetous kindleth strife.**—רְחַב נֶפֶשׁ is certainly not the "proud" (Vulg., LUTHER, EWALD, BERTHEAU, ELSTER [GESEN., FUERST, DE W., E. V., N., S., M.], *etc.*), but the man of large cupidity (comp. Is. v. 14; Hab. ii. 5), the avaricious and insatiable, ἀπληστος (LXX, UMBREIT, STIER, HITZIG [K., H.]). By his covetous grasping and his overreaching others, he "kindles strife" (comp. xv. 18; xxix. 22), instead of living like the man who patiently trusts in the Lord's help in peaceful quietness and with the prosperous development of his possessions as they multiply under the Divine blessing. For the expression "shall be made fat," *i. e.*, shall be richly rewarded, compare xi. 25; xiii. 4.

Ver. 26. **He that trusteth in his own heart**—*i. e.*, not "he who relies on his own immediate feelings" (UMBREIT, ELSTER), but he who suffers himself to be guided solely by his own spirit (comp. Jer. xxx. 21), by his own inconsiderate, defiant impulse to act, and therefore follows exclusively his own counsel (xxvii. 9). Comp. HITZIG and STIER on the passage.

Ver. 27. **He that giveth to the poor** (suffereth) **no want.**—For the sentiment comp. xi. 24; for the elliptical construction (the omission of the pronoun "to him" with the "no want"), chap. xxvii. 7 *b*.—**He that covereth his eyes**, *i. e.*, turns them unsympathizingly away from such as need help, that he may not see their wretchedness; comp. Is. i. 15, as well as the similar expressions, Deut. xxxi. 17; 1 John iii. 17 (κλείειν τὰ σπλάγχνα).—**Hath abundance of curses**—of imprecations from the oppressed poor; the opposite, therefore, of ver. 20.

Ver. 28. Comp. 12 *b*.—**But when they perish the righteous increase**;—*i. e.*, the righteous who were before oppressed and chased away come out to view again on all sides and form once more a numerous and strong party. Comp. xxix. 2; and also xi. 10, 21.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

A peculiar "religious complexion" belongs not merely to the first half of the chapter, vers. 1-16 (as HITZIG asserts, who separates this portion from its older surroundings as a peculiar interpolation originating after the exile), but to the whole section, as is shown with reference to the second part, particularly by vers. 18, 20, 24, 25. That which gives to the chapter its specifically religious character is, the repeated admonitions to hear and keep the Divine law (vers. 4, 7, 9), to seek Jehovah (ver. 5), to trust in Him, (ver. 25, 26), to a walking in "faithfulness" (ver. 20), and in blamelessness or innocence (ver. 18), and therefore in a general consecration,—to fear of God's sacred anger (ver. 14); and also in no less degree the warnings against wanton and flattering suppression of the consciousness of sin (vers. 13, 24), against a hardening in the service of sin (ver. 14), and against the betrayal of others into sin (ver. 10). Undoubtedly it is the desire to exhibit as the "root of all evil" and as a main radical form of ungodliness and lawlessness in general, the vice which is most sharply censured and opposed, that of covetousness, or the mighty rapacity of the wicked,—and accordingly to warn against it in the most emphatic way,—that led the compiler to accumulate just in the passage before us so many thoughts with respect to the religious relation of men to God. For beside these admonitory and warning proverbs which refer directly to this relation, the substance of the chapter is made up almost exclusively of warnings against wicked violence on the part of rulers in their dealing with the lowly (ver. 1, 3, 12, 15, 16, 28), of rich with the poor (vers. 6, 8, 11, 24), and of the covetous and greedy of gain in their relation to the inoffensive and unsuspecting (vers. 19-22, 25, 26). A logically developed progress of thought, it is true, is wanting; the combination is mixed of many colors, in the style of the "strings of pearls" in the gnomic poetry of the East, in which it is rather external than internal contacts and analogies that determine the concatenation of the several proverbs or groups of proverbs.

HOMILETIC AND PRACTICAL.

Homily on the entire chapter. Of avarice as the foulest stain on the conscience, or as the mother of all vices (1 Tim. vi. 10).—Or, on walking in the fear of the Lord and a good conscience, and also on the chief dangers that threaten such a devout conscientious life.—Comp. STÖCKER: On the second hinderance to the attainment of true wisdom: an evil, terrified, timorous conscience; its source and characteristics, as well as the remedies for it (in a similar style, WOHLFARTH).

Vers. 1 sq. LUTHER (marginal comment on ver. 1); One's own conscience is more than a thousand witnesses.—CRAMER: An evil conscience makes timid (Job xv. 21); but faith and a good

conscience make the heart joyous, so that it is not terrified before death and the devil (Ps. xci. 7).—[ARNOT: No *man* pursueth; and yet a pursuer is on the track of the fugitive, otherwise he would not flee. When they escape from man, God is the pursuer of the guilty. By conscience chiefly God apprehends us—thereby chiefly we apprehend God].—LANGE (on ver. 2): When subjects are oppressed and vexed, they are not to rebel or curse the authorities, but seek the causes of such judgments in themselves, turn and bring forth fruits meet for repentance.—VON GERLACH (on ver. 5): To the understanding of the law there belongs a disposition to fear God, otherwise the clearest knowledge of the letter is of no avail; while men that fear God attain a sure comprehension of all.—[MUFFET: Albeit there is some light in the wicked man which is sufficient to make him inexcusable, yet he is always so blinded by natural ignorance and malice that both Christ and the law to him is a mystery.—BRIDGES: When knowledge stands in the stead of faith; when the man reasons instead of submitting to Divine teaching; knowledge abused becomes a positive hinderance to a correct understanding.]

Vers. 6–12. CRAMER (on ver. 6): As his riches do not help the rich man at all toward blessedness, so his poverty does not harm the poor in that direction.—(On ver. 8): God often rewards even here kindness shown to the poor, though it may show itself first to the children of the benefactors.—*Würtemberg Bible* (on ver. 9): He that would be heard by God in his prayer must first hear God in His word and subject himself to its direction.—[BP. HOPKINS: God stops His ears against their prayers who stop their ears against His law. And this is but equity with God.]—VON GERLACH: Even the best that man can do becomes a sin to him when he does it with a disposition of disobedience to the Divine word.—(On ver. 11): Trust in outward blessings easily brings with it false self-confidence, and it is very natural for the rich to wish to lay claim likewise to inward excellencies and advantages. The poor man standing by unconcerned and simple, nevertheless overlooks and searches him through, and by his very poverty has more of spiritual superiority.—STARKE (on ver. 12): A large proportion of subjects conform to the conduct of their superiors. Blessed is the land whose rulers govern piously and praiseworthily!—[TRAPP (on ver. 10): Heaven is kept for the upright, and they for heaven; how then should they miss of it?]

Ver. 13–19. MELANCHTHON (on ver. 13): As in all conversion repentance must be the first thing, *i. e.*, recognition of transgression and guilt, combined with a sore change of disposition,—so here confession of sin is demanded, and such a one as leads to sincere reformation of the feelings and conduct, like that of Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 9, 10. For necessarily in confession of sin every evil purpose must be given up, because with persistence in these penitence is no true penitence.—Comp. the Absolution-sermon on ver. 13 by WELCKER (*Sonntagsfeier*, 1839): Be not ashamed to confess, for he only who confesses will obtain mercy, and no competitor is crowned except he strive lawfully.—[LAWSON: To endeavor to shelter ourselves under coverings that are not of God's Spirit, is an additional provocation to the eyes of His glory.—TRAPP: Sin is a deformity that must be uncovered, or God will never cover it; see it we must to confession, or see it we shall to our confusion. No man was ever kept out of heaven for his confessed badness; many are for their supposed goodness.—ARNOT: Sin cast forth from the heart is harmless. It cannot then pollute the life; and it will not then remain an element of treasured wrath.—BATES (on ver. 14): Blessed is the man who considers that God's eyes are always upon him in order to judgment, and whose eyes are always upon God in order to acceptance.—J. HOWE: It is a very hopeful character upon you when you are really afraid lest a controversy should still depend, and not be taken up between God and you.—J. EDWARDS: A saint is apt to be sensible of his spiritual dangers, jealous of himself, full of fear when he cannot see his way plain before him, afraid to be left alone, and to be at a distance from God.]—STARKE: Searing and hardening the heart is a heavy judgment. If thou wouldst not fall into it, then hear betimes the grace that knocks at thy door.—(On ver. 18): There is only one way to eternal life; he that turns from that to the right or to the left, and would make himself sidepaths, will fall into ruin.—VON GERLACH (on ver. 19): As a reward for his vain striving the simple receives only vanity.—[LAWSON (on ver. 17): The murderer of his neighbor is his own murderer.]

Vers. 20 sq. [LORD BACON (on ver. 21): In a judge facility of disposition is more pernicious than bribery; for it is not every one that offers a bribe, but there is scarcely a case wherein something may not be found to bias the mind of the judge, if he be a respecter of persons.]—CRAMER (on vers. 20–22): Striving after riches has become to many a one a cause of many sins; and these are the very tares which (according to Luke viii. 14) choke the word of God.—*Tübingen Bible* (on ver. 23): Speak the truth always, even though thou see that it is bitter. The future will show that thou still farest better with this than do shameful flatterers.—(On ver. 24): To take any thing from parents the Spirit of God calls a theft, robbing the children of all prosperity and all blessing.—[FLAVEL (on ver. 23): There is no better way to secure our own interest in any man's heart, than to fasten it in his conscience by our faithfulness, and by being willing to hazard it for God's glory.—SOUTH (on ver. 26): Of all the fallacies and scurvy cheats put upon men by their trusting others, there are none so shameful, and indeed pernicious, as the baffles which men sustain by trusting themselves.]—GEIER (on ver. 26): In our own important affairs we should never rely upon ourselves alone, but ever hearken to others' counsel. Does not even a physician in his sickness employ the counsel of other physicians?—WOHLFARTH: Trust not in thine heart, but in the Lord.

Digitized by Google

d) **Against stubbornness and insubordination.**

CHAP. XXIX.

1 He that being often reproved hardeneth his neck
shall suddenly be destroyed and without remedy.
2 When the righteous increase the people rejoice,
but when a wicked man ruleth the people mourn.
3 He that loveth wisdom maketh his father glad,
but he that keepeth company with harlots spendeth his substance.
4 The king will establish the land by judgment,
but a man (fond) of bribes destroyeth it.
5 A man who flattereth his neighbor
spreadeth a net for his feet.
6 In the transgression of the wicked man is a snare,
but the righteous will rejoice and be glad.
7 The righteous knoweth the cause of the poor;
the wicked doth not discern knowledge.
8 Scoffers set on fire the city,
but wise men turn back anger.
9 A wise man contendeth with the fool;
but he rageth, and laugheth, and there is no rest.
10 Men of blood hate the upright,
but the righteous seek his soul (to deliver it).
11 All his wrath doth the fool pour forth,
but the wise quieteth it afterward.
12 A ruler that giveth heed to deceitful words,
all his servants are wicked.
13 The poor man and the usurer meet together;
Jehovah giveth light to the eyes of both.
14 A king who judgeth the poor faithfully,
his throne shall be established for ever.
15 The rod and reproof impart wisdom;
but a neglected son causeth his mother shame.
16 When the wicked are multiplied transgression increaseth;
but the righteous shall see their fall.
17 Correct thy son, and he will give thee rest,
and bring delight to thy soul.
18 When there is no revelation the people are ungoverned,
but he that keepeth the law, blessed is he!
19 By words a servant will not be corrected;
for he perceiveth them but doth not conform to them.
20 Seest thou a man hasty in his words;
the fool hath more hope than he.
21 One bringeth up his servant tenderly from a child
and afterward he shall be a son.
22 An angry man stirreth up strife,
and a passionate man aboundeth in transgression.
23 A man's pride shall bring him low,
but he that is of a lowly spirit retaineth honor.
24 He that is partner with a thief hateth his own soul;
he heareth the curse and showeth it not.
25 Fear of man bringeth a snare,
but he that trusteth Jehovah shall be preserved.

Digitized by Google

26 Many seek the favor of the ruler,
but from Jehovah cometh man's judgment.
27 An abomination to the righteous is the unjust man,
and an abomination to the wicked is he who is upright in his way.

GRAMMATICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 5.—With מַחֲלִיק we should, according to xxviii. 23, supply לָשׁוֹן; and עַל expresses here the dative relation as אֶל usually does; Comp. Ps. xxxvi. 3.

Ver. 6.—יָרוּן stands for יָרֹן, illustrating a very common transition from עע roots into the עו form; EWALD, § 138, a. [GREEN, § 140, 1 BOTT. § 1147, A., *etc.*]

Ver. 10.—Between דָמִים and תָּם there seems to be an assonance intended.

Ver. 18.—[אַשְׁרֵהוּ an instance of the attachment of the suffix of the singular to form *pluralia tantum*; comp. אַשְׁרָיו in xiv. 21; xvi. 20. the only other instances in which the noun occurs with the suffix of 3d pers. sing. BÖTT. suggests that this may be a trace of the dialect of Ephraim; § 886, δ and n. 1; § 888, 1.—A.]

Ver. 25.—חֲרָדַת BÖTT. treats as a fem. Infin. (§ 990, 4, *B* and *n*.3), and notices the not uncommon sequence of a masculine predicate (990, 3, β.).—A.]

EXEGETICAL.

1. Vers. 1-7. Against various forms of obstinate unrighteousness, especially oppression, prodigality, flattery, *etc.*—**He that is often reproved, being stiffnecked.** A "man of corrections" or "reproofs" (for which HITZIG needlessly substitu s תּוֹכָחוֹת "punishments" [which GESEN. would render "arguments," *i. e.*, a man who when censured defends himself]) is one who deserves many corrections, is continually bringing them upon himself (comp. the "man of sorrows," Is. liii. 3). Here he is described as such a man, who "maketh his neck hard," *i. e.*, the stiffnecked man who will everywhere defiantly carry through his own will (comp. Ex. xxxii. 9; xxxiii. 3; xxxix. 9; Deut. ix. 6; xxxi. 27, *etc.*; and also the "hardening of the heart" in chap. xxviii. 14). [The E. V. which is followed by nearly all our expositors, and which we have given in the general version of the chapter, makes the obstinacy not the original cause of the many corrections, that for which the offender is in the first instance reproved, but the disposition evinced by him under all reproofs whatsoever. The final difference is not great; sudden and utter destruction will follow and end unavailing reproofs.—A.]. With *b* compare the literally identical second clause of chap. vi. 15.

Ver. 2. **When the righteous increase.** According to chap. xxviii. 28 this is the same thing as "the wicked's perishing." HITZIG: "when righteous men attain to power,"—an unnecessary assimilation of the meaning of the verb to that in clause *b*. For the rest compare xxviii. 12.

Ver. 3. With *a* compare x. 1; with *b*, vi. 26; xxviii. 7.

Ver. 4. **A king will establish the land by judgment,** (*i. e.*, by the maintenance of justice) For the verb comp. 1 Kings xv. 4. The "man of gifts (bribes)" is then naturally the unjust ruler who "perverts justice from love of gifts" (BERTHEAU). ROSENMUELLER and HITZIG explain the phrase as meaning "a man of taxes or assessments;" in like manner LUTHER: "he who assesses the land excessively." This is possible, but not demonstrable with full certainty. The conception of the Vulgate is at any rate too general: *Vir avarus*, and also STIER's; "he who willingly receives presents." [K. agrees with HITZIG, *etc.*; H., N., S., M., take our author's view.]

Ver. 5. **A man who flattereth his neighbor;** see Critical notes.—**Spreadeth a net for his feet.** "He does this even when he is not intending it; the web of enticing errors before his neighbor's eyes, becomes, when he comes into contact with them, a net in which he is caught" (HITZIG). For the sentiment comp. xxvi 24, 25, 28.

Ver. 6. **In the transgression of the wicked man is a snare,** *i. e.*, for himself; comp. xviii. 7; xx. 25; xxii. 25. HITZIG proposes instead of the noun the corresponding verb (in the Niphal); "In the sin of the wicked he ensnareth himself." A change plainly as superfluous as that of EWALD, who, following the steps of some earlier expositors but clearly in violation of the order of words, combines the epithet "evil" with the "snare."—**But the righteous will rejoice and be glad,** *i. e.*, in his own happy escape from danger. For a like combination of רָנַן to exult, or shout for joy, and שָׂמַח to be glad, comp. Ps. xxxv. 27.

Ver. 7. **The righteous knoweth the cause of the poor,** *i. e.*, their judicial cause, their claims before a court. For this use of the verb "to know" comp. xii. 10; for the sentiment ver. 14; Job xxix. 12, 16.—**The wicked doth not discern knowledge** (others "know understanding"); *i. e.*, he listens to no reason, has no sensibility for right and equity (HITZIG). Comp. xxviii. 5. [This explanation, which is also WORDSWORTH's ("knowledge, which consists in piety and charity"), we prefer to the more external one given, *e. g.*, by H., S., M.; does not acquaint himself with the poor man's cause.—A.]

2. Vers. 8-11. Against scoffing, contentiousness, thirst for blood and passionateness.—**Mockers set on fire the city.** "Men of derision" is a more select expression for the common לֵצִים "scorners," one found likewise in Is. xxviii. 14 [intending and meaning more than would be ordinarily suggested by the rendering of the E. V.; "scornful men."—A.]. The "setting on fire" (lit. "blowing upon," comp. Ezek. xxi. 36) the city is a fitly chosen figurative expression for the excitement of the passion and the party spirit of the people of the city; קִרְיָה

Digitized by Google

stands here like πόλις in Matth. xii. 24 of the community of the city.—With *b* comp. xv. 1, 18; Eccles. x. 4. [The connection is not unknown in modern times of religious skepticism and rationalism, with political radicalism and a revolutionary spirit.—A.].

Ver. 9. **A wise man contendeth with a fool;—but he rageth and laugheth and there is no rest.** The first clause forms, somewhat like the *abl. absol.* in Latin, a clause by itself, the participle of which may be resolved into "if or when the wise contendeth, *etc.*" The subject of the verbs in *b* is the fool and not the wise man (EWALD, UMBREIT, ELSTER, STIER [DE W., MUFFET, N., *etc*, while BERTHEAU, K, H., S., *etc.*, understand "the fool," the E. V., M and others being ambiguous]), in which case the וְאֵין נָחַת (and there is no ceasing, no rest comes, comp. 1 Sam. xxv. 9) would form quite too short a conclusion; moreover the "raging" and the "laughing" appear to be much rather characteristic signs of the fool's conduct than of the wise man's; comp. ver. 11 and chap. xii. 16.

Ver. 10. **Men of blood hate the upright.** "Men of blood" as in Ps. v. 7; xxvi. 9; lv. 24; cxxxix. 19.—**But the righteous seek his soul,** *viz.*, to preserve and prosper it. That the "seeking the soul" here stands *bono sensu*, unlike its use in some other passages (*e. g.*, Ps. xl. 15; 1 Kings xix 10, *etc.*,) [on the other hand comp. דּוֹרֵשׁ לְנַפְשִׁי in Ps. cxlii. 5], appears from the contrast with clause *a;* HITZIG's emendation is therefore unnecessary, substituting וְלִשְׁכֵם for וִישָׁרִים, and thus obtaining as the meaning: "and seek to separate his soul, to isolate it" (!). [Of our expositors H. prefers the common rendering of the predicate, and makes "the upright" a nom. or acc. absolute.—A.]

Ver. 11. **All his wrath doth the fool pour forth.** "Spirit" is here plainly wrath, as in xvi. 32, and not "soul" (UMBREIT) or "mind" STIER, *etc.;* [so E. V. and some of our interpreters]).—**But the wise quieteth it afterward.** בְּאָחוֹר, which occurs only here, means "afterward, at length"; others explain this unusual expression by "back, *retrorsum;*" *e. g.*, DE W., STIER, HITZIG, GESEN., *etc.:* "Keepeth it back, restraining it, pressing it in as it were (?)."

3. Vers. 12-17. Admonitions to a just and mild mode of government, and also the strict discipline of children. With ver. 12 comp. Ecclesiast. x. 2, and also CIC. *De Leg.*, III. 13 and the Latin proverb; *Qualis rex talis grex*, "like king, like people."

Ver. 13. **The poor man and the usurer** (oppressor) **meet together.** The "man of exactions" should be interpreted with the LXX (δανειστής), Vulg. (*creditor*), EWALD, HITZIG, FUERST, *etc.*, by "usurer," inasmuch as תְּכָכִים, as a plural from תֹּךְ (τοκος) [?] is very probably equivalent in meaning to נֶשֶׁךְ "usury;" [RÖD., BÖTT., *etc.*, prefer the broader meaning "oppression"]. A "man of usury, money-lender" is furthermore only a more concrete expression for a "rich man," and this is the corresponding term in chap. xxii. 2.—**Jehovah giveth light to the eyes of both;** *i. e.*, according to the parallels cited, Jehovah has given to them both the light of their life; from God comes to both the light of life and the joy of life; comp. Ps. xiii. 4; Job xxxiii. 30; Eccles. xi. 7. ["Here is comfort to the poor in his sufferings; here is warning to the rich in his violence." WORDS.]

Ver. 14. **A king who judgeth the poor faithfully.** "In truth, or fidelity" is not here "conscientiously, with truth to his own convictions," but conformably to the state of the facts, "so that he permits true judgment (Zech. vii. 9) to reach the poor" (HITZIG). With the sentiment comp. xx. 28; xxv. 5.

Ver. 15. With *a* comp. xxiii. 13; xiii. 24; with *b*, x. 1; xvii. 21; xxviii. 7. The "neglected" is literally "he who is exempted from discipline, who is left to his own will."

Ver. 16. **When the wicked are multiplied transgression increaseth,** so far forth as the wicked who are found in the decided majority think that they may with impunity commit all manner of wickedness. With *b* comp. Ps. xxxvii. 34 where the joyful beholding of the destruction of the wicked is expressed by the same phrase.

Ver. 17. With *a* comp. xix. 18.—**And give delight to thy soul.** מַעֲדַנִּים not "delicacies, dainties" (BERTHEAU), but delights, joys in general, whose increasing variety is expressed by the plural (STIER).

4. Vers. 18-23. Against lawlessness, insubordination, a passionate temper, and pride.—**When there is no revelation the people are ungoverned.** חָזוֹן here denotes prophetic prediction, the revelation of God by His חֹזִים or רֹאֶה, "seers" (1 Sam. ix. 9), [E. V. "where there is no vision"]; the chief function of these consisted in their watching over the vigorous fulfilling of the law, or in the enforcement of the demands of the law. By the phrase "in lack of vision" a time is described like that mentioned in 1 Sam. iii. 1, when "the word of the Lord was precious;" or like those mentioned in Hos. iii. 4; Am. viii. 12; 2 Chron. xv. 3; Ps. lxxiv. 9, times distinguished by poverty in prophetic testimonies and activities. In such times the people must necessarily be "undisciplined and unbridled," (so Ex. xxxiv. 25 [where the E. V. incorrectly renders "naked"]).—**But he that keepeth the law blessed is he!** (comp. xiv. 21; xvi. 20.) This benediction forms no strict antithesis to clause *a*. The connection of ideas seems to be this: But he who in such seasons of ascendant lawlessness nevertheless keeps God's law, *etc.*" (HITZIG).

Ver. 19. **By words a servant will not be corrected;** *i. e.*, mere words do not reform a servant, who rather needs a sharper correction.—**For he perceiveth them but doth not conform to them;** lit. "but there is not an answer," that is in action, by actual obedience, by ὑπακοή (2 Cor. x. 6, *etc.*). BERTHEAU is wrong: "For he will observe it—that there is no coming to blows—and there will be no answer;" no less is EWALD incorrect: "But he becomes intelligent (gains understanding) without an answer," and likewise VON HOFMANN, *Schriftbew.*, II. 2, 377: "if he has understanding no answer follows."

Digitized by Google

Ver. 20. Almost exactly like xxvi. 12. Comp. also Ecclesiast. ix. 18, where the προπετὴς ἐν λόγῳ αὐτοῦ corresponds precisely with the "hasty in his words" of our verse.

Ver. 21. **If one bringeth up his slave tenderly from a child afterward he will be a son.** The relation of the two clauses is like that in ver. 9, פנק "to fondle" is used here only in the O. T.; it is more common in Aramaic. מָנוֹן which according to the Rabbinic is cognate with נִין *suboles*, seems to be designed to distinguish "the son of the household," the free *filius familias* in contrast with the house-slave; comp. LUTHER's term "*Junker*" [a "squire"]. Others interpret the *Hapaxlegom.* differently, *e. g.* EWALD, following the Arabic: "he will be unthankful" [FUERST, "intractable"]: STIER "his end will be (evil) development;" VON HOFMANN, *ubi supra:* "there is at last a lamentation," *etc.* [HOLDEN: "shall be grieved"]. HITZIG reads מָנוֹר which is to be interpreted, like Ps. xliv. 15 (14) "a shaking of the head," or even "a wringing of the hands!" To write מָדוֹן would be more natural than this: "his end will be contention," as the Vulgate seems to have understood the expression, when it renders: *postea sentiet eum contumacem.*

Ver. 22. **An angry man stirreth up strife.** Almost precisely like xv. 18; comp. xxviii. 25.—**And a passionate man aboundeth in transgression**; for רַב in the sense of "great or rich in something," comp. xxviii. 20, 27. See chap. xxii. 24 for a phrase kindred to the "lord of passion," *i. e.*, the passionate man.

Ver. 23. With *a* compare xvi. 18; xxv. 7; with *b*, xvi. 19; xi. 16.

5. Ver. 24-27. Warning against the fear of man, disposition to please men, and complicity in transgressions.—**He that is partner with a thief hateth himself**; *i. e.*, inasmuch as he, as the concealer of a thief, brings upon himself the guilt and likewise the penalty of the full theft.—**He heareth the curse and showeth it not**; *i. e.*, he hears the curse which according to the law (Lev. v. 1 sq.) marks a theft as an offence deserving a heavy penalty, and yet does not reveal the perpetrators of the deed which is laden with such a curse, and thus brings the curse also upon himself. [The E. V. is altogether ambiguous and misleading.]

Ver. 25. **Fear of man bringeth a snare.** Fear of man (for which HITZIG conjectures חֲמֹד לְאָדָם, "desiring or delighting in man") is strictly "trembling before men;" comp. 1 Sam. xiv. 15. Such a fear of man "bringeth a snare," because it easily betrays into a participation in the sinful actions of men. With *b* comp. xviii. 10.

Ver. 26. **Many seek the face** (favor) **of the ruler**; they wait upon him, the potentate, in person, as a token of their homage, and in order to gain his favor. Comp xix. 6; 1 Kings x. 24.—**But from Jehovah cometh man's judgment**; *i. e.*, God, the Supreme Ruler, allots the destinies of men most justly and equitably; with Him one obtains the desired judgment more certainly than with any human ruler whatsoever. Comp. xvi. 33. HITZIG arbitrarily says: "judgment is here equivalent to rank, dignity."

Ver. 27. Comp. xi. 20; xxviii. 4; and for the expression "they that walk uprightly," or are "upright in the way," in clause *b*, see in particular Ps. xxxvii. 14, and also Prov. ii. 7.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

When early expositors (STÖCKER, WOHLFARTH, *etc.*, comp. also STIER) represent the chapter before us as directed especially against stiff-necked obstinacy, or against wilful disobedience and persistent refusal of correction, this conception of its main subject not only corresponds with ver. 1, but also with the repeated occurrence of rebukes of lawless conduct and the bad training of children, such as the following series of proverbs exhibits (vers. 9, 12, 15, 17, 18, 19, 21). Besides the manifold warnings against violent temper and its evil consequences fall under the same category (vers. 8, 11, 22); in like manner the dissuasions against prodigality (ver. 8), oppression of the poor (vers. 2, 7, 13, 14), pride (ver. 28), flattery and bribery (vers. 4, 5, 12), injustice and deeds of wickedness in general (vers. 6, 10, 16, 27). As a peculiar form of insubordination, or persistent disregard of the divine law, there is brought out prominently toward the end of the chapter the *fear of man*, which has not before been expressly mentioned in the Book of Proverbs. And this is done in such a way as to distinguish three degrees of this fault; the concealing of a theft, as its rudest and lowest form (ver. 24); the "trembling before men," or pliability with respect to such conduct of wicked persons in general as is sinful and entices to sin (ver. 25); and the mere disposition to please men, or reliance on the protection and favor of powerful men, instead of on God alone (ver. 26).

A special adaptation to the theocratic political organization of the people of God under the Old Testament is given to the general direction which the chapter takes against wilfulness, insubordination and want of discipline, in ver. 18: **When there is no revelation, the people become lawless; but he that keepeth the law, blessed is he!** In this remarkable testimony to the need of prophecy as the living watch and ward of the law, there is evidently brought to view that thought which is doctrinally and in respect to the history of salvation the most significant in the section. This is a thought which could develop itself and find expression only after repeated periods had occurred in which prophecy was wholly or partially silent, and therefore only on the ground of sorrowful experiences that had accumulated in such seasons. The appearance of this thought, however, in the section before us by no means compels the assumption that this division of the book may not have originated till after Hezekiah, and this HITZIG also admits. Comp. above, the exegetical interpretation of the passage.

The great significance of prophecy for the moral life, both of the theocratic people of God and of Christian nations, has been well presented by ELSTER, in connection with this passage. "Where the continuity of these prophetic revelations (to which it belonged to maintain in life and to develop the fundamental revelation made in the law) was interrupted, this was the sign of a stagnation in the theocratic life, of an incapacity

Digitized by Google

to understand the voice of God that ever continued to exist in Israel. Such a condition must therefore necessarily bring with it also a moral lawlessness in the people. For when the law was a vivid reality, it must necessarily develop prophetic manifestations, because there is in the law itself a struggling toward a higher perfection, so that the faithful keeping of the law stood in the most intimate reciprocity with the flourishing of prophecy.—Naturally the relation of this proverb to the life of Christian nations is thereby not excluded, for we must then contemplate the law as first revealed in its true import in the light of the gospel, and revelation as the continued working of the Spirit in the Church "

How far moreover in the life of Christian nations we can and must speak of an abiding coöperative work of prophecy (*i. e.*, naturally that of the New Testament), upon its successful development, religious and moral, VON ZEZSCHWITZ has shown with peculiar force and pertinence in his three discourses on "Domestic Missions, popular education and prophecy" (Frankfort on the Main, 1864); see in particular pp. 86 sq.

HOMILETIC AND PRACTICAL.

Homily on the chapter as a whole: The blessing of strict discipline on the basis of the word of God, or its necessity for the prosperity whether of individual persons and households, or of entire nations and States.—STÖCKER: Third hinderance to the attainment of true wisdom: obstinate disobedience or stubbornness; origin, characteristics and remedy of this evil.

Vers. 1-7. [TRAPP (on ver. 1): If men harden their hearts, God will harden His hand.—J. HOWE: A fearful thing when the gospel itself shall not be my remedy!—CHALMERS: The hardening effect of continued resistance to the application of a moral force.—S. DAVIES: To follow the conduct of our own folly and refuse the advantage we might receive from the wisdom of others discovers an uncreaturely pride and self-sufficiency; and the career of such a pursuit, whatever be its object, will always end in disappointment and confusion.—HOOKER (on ver. 2): Religion unfeignedly loved perfecteth man's abilities unto all kind of virtuous services in the commonwealth.]—ZELTNER (on ver. 1): He that obstinately opposes the Holy Ghost and will not receive the wholesome corrections of God's word, his heart the evil spirit hardens; he thereby plunges himself into calamity.—(On ver. 3): Pious parents can experience no greater joy than when they see their children walk in true wisdom and the fear of God.—(On ver. 5): The caress of a flatterer is much more dangerous than the hatred of an enemy.—[SOUTH (on ver. 5): Three Sermons on Flattery.—BRIDGES (on ver. 6): There is always a snare in the ways of sin; always a song in the ways of God.]—LANGE (on ver. 7): Let judges and rulers take good heed lest they by their negligence in the cause of the humble be reckoned as among the ungodly.—VON GERLACH: By righteousness there is opened to man a view into all departments of life; especially may he transfer himself into the position and case of the oppressed; while to the wicked man, who looks on every thing superficially, such insight is denied, and he therefore easily comes to oppress the poor.

Vers. 8-11. HASIUS (on ver. 8): An unwashed mouth may easily stir up much evil; but it is a characteristic of wisdom to make the best of every thing.—STARKE: A true Christian is at the same time a good citizen in the commonwealth; for he seeks to produce and preserve peace.—[LORD BACON: Scorners weaken all the foundations of civil government; a thing the more to be attended to, because the mischief is wrought not openly, but by secret engines and intrigues.—LAWSON: The holy seed are the substance and strength of a land.—Lord BACON (on ver. 9): In this contest the chances are altogether unequal; seeing it is no victory to conquer, and a great disgrace to be conquered.]—LANGE: One should not suffer himself to be kept from the proclamation of the truth by the opposition of foolish people, 2 Tim. iv. 2: if one does not receive it, another does.—VON GERLACH (on ver. 11): Among the characteristics of folly there is always found a boisterous, ungovernable nature; to wisdom belongs self-command.

Ver. 12-17. MELANCHTHON (on ver. 12): The example of distinguished persons, such as rulers, teachers, *etc.*, avails and effects very much, and that in both directions, by promoting good as well as evil. Most rapidly, however, is the plague of base vices transmitted, especially in the circle of household companions, and in the daily retinue of these persons of high station.—[MUFFET: He that carrieth Satan in his ear is no less blameworthy than he which carrieth him in his tongue.]—CRAMER (on ver. 13): The Holy Scriptures are for poor and for rich; every one findeth his own chapter therein adapted to himself. But in order that the one as well as the other may see what is needful for them, both need enlightenment and divine help.—STARKE (on ver. 14): Not so much by strength and might as rather by faithful, kind and righteous treatment of subjects is a government preserved and confirmed.—VON GERLACH (on vers. 15, 17): Mothers are wont to be most at fault in indulging their children, and must therefore bear away the chief shame of its fruits.—[CHALMERS: By joining the rod with the reproof, the moral is sometimes the better enforced when there is added to it the physical appliance.]

Ver. 18. LUTHER: Without God's word man can do nothing but practise idolatry and his own will.—MELANCHTHON: As well princes as people must consider that pious governments, which God aids by His counsel and blessing, are more needful than all things beside; they must therefore beseech God for such a wholesome government, and not plunge themselves in sin and vice, lest God withdraw it from them as a judgment.—STÖCKER (special sermon for married people, based on ver. 18): On the indispensable necessity of the divine word to a blessed domestic relation: *a*) How Christian hearts should stand related to the word of God; *b*) What advantage and reward they have from its right use.—WOHLFARTH: Take religion from man and he sinks into the deepest barbarism.—[FLAVEL: The Spirit and the word of God usually come and go together.]

Vers. 19-27. ZELTNER (on vers. 19-21): As self-willed menials do when they are indulged, so

Digitized by Google

likewise our own vile flesh and blood. If one leaves to this its own will even a little, it will quickly rule over the spirit, Gal. v. 17 sq.—[LORD BACON (on ver. 21): Princes and masters ought to keep a measure in conferring grace and favor on their servants. . . . Sudden promotion begets insolence; continual obtaining of desires begets impatience of refusal; and if there be nothing further to aspire to, there will be an absence of alacrity and industry.]—STARKE (on ver. 24): Both the bold sinner himself and he likewise who makes himself partaker in the sins of others, brings upon himself God's wrath and punishment.—(On ver. 25): It is a sinful fear of man when one from timidity acts to please others against his conscience.—A means against this fear of man is pre-eminently prayer for a joyous spirit (Ps. li. 12, 14), and faith and child-like reliance on God's protection. —[FLAVEL: Men vainly "hope to find mercy with God," but expect none from men; so the voice of conscience is drowned by the louder clamors and threats of adversaries.—ARNOT: It is not a transference of fear from man to God that makes a sinner safe; the kind of affection must be changed as well as its object. Safety lies not in terror, but in trust. Hope leads to holiness.]—VON GERLACH (on ver. 26): Justice and favor which princes can ensure are indifferent in the presence of God's decision. —(On ver. 27): It is no good sign for him who would be upright when he can be on friendly terms with the ungodly.

V. THE SUPPLEMENTS.

CHAPS. XXX. and XXXI.

First Supplement: The words of Agur.

CHAP. XXX.

a) INTRODUCTION: Of God's word as the source of all wisdom.

Vers. 1–6.

1 Words of Agur, the son of the princess of Massa.
The man's saying: "I have wearied myself about God,
wearied myself about God—then did I withdraw!
2 For I am a beast and not a man,
and the understanding of a man I have not;
3 neither have I acquired wisdom,
nor gained knowledge of the Holy.
4 Who hath ascended to the heavens and descended?
who hath grasped the wind in his fists?
who hath wrapped the waters in a garment?
who hath fixed all the ends of the earth?
what is his name and what is his son's name, if thou knowest?
5 Every word of God is pure;
a shield is He to them that trust in Him.
6 Add thou not to His words,
lest He rebuke thee and thou be made a liar."

b) Various expressive numerical proverbs, relating to the golden mean between rich and poor, to recklessness, an insatiable disposition, pride and arrogance, *etc.*

7 Two things have I entreated of thee,
refuse me not, before I die:
8 Deceit and lies keep far from me;
poverty and riches give me not;
cause me to eat the food allotted me;
9 lest I, being full, deny (God)
and say: Who is Jehovah?
and lest I, having become poor, steal
and take the name of my God in vain.—

Digitized by Google

10 Cause not the servant to slander his master,
lest he curse thee and thou suffer (be destroyed).—
11 (There is) a generation that curseth their father,
and doth not bless their mother;
12 (there is) a generation that are pure in their own eyes,
and are not washed from their filthiness;
13 (there is) a generation, how haughty are their eyes,
and their eyelids are lifted up;
14 (there is) a generation whose teeth are swords, and their jaw-teeth knives,
to devour the poor from the earth, and the needy from among men!—
15 The leech hath two daughters: give, give!
there are three (things) that are not to be satisfied;
four say not: enough!
16 The world of the dead, the barren womb;
the earth (which) is not satisfied with water,
and the fire that saith not: enough!—
17 An eye that mocketh at its father,
and despiseth obedience to its mother,
the ravens of the valley shall pluck it out,
and the young eagles shall eat it.—
18 Three things are too wonderful for me,
and four I do not comprehend;
19 the way of the eagle in the heavens,
the way of a serpent upon a rock,
the way of a ship in the midst of the sea,
and the way of a man with a maid.
20 Thus is the way of the adulterous woman:
she eateth, and wipeth her mouth, and saith:
I have done no iniquity!—
21 Under three things doth the earth tremble,
and under four can it not stand:
22 under a servant when he ruleth,
and a fool when he is satisfied with bread;
23 under a hated (rejected) woman when she is married,
and a maid when she succeedeth her mistress.
24 Four are the little things of earth,
and yet are they wise, quick of wit:
25 the ants, a people not strong,
that prepare in summer their food;
26 conies, a people not mighty,
that set their dwelling among rocks;
27 no king have the locusts,
and yet they go forth organized all of them;
28 the lizard layeth hold with her hands,
and dwelleth in kings' palaces.—
29 There are three that make stately their walk,
and four that are comely in going:
30 the lion, mighty among beasts,
and that turneth not before any:
31 the greyhound, slender in its loins, or the goat,
and a king with whom there is no resistance (possible).—
32 If thou art foolish in exalting thyself,
and if thou devisest evil—(put) thy hand on thy mouth!
33 For the pressing of milk giveth forth cheese,
and pressing the nose giveth blood,
and pressing wrath giveth strife.

Digitized by Google

GRAMMATICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 6.—[In תּוֹכְף we have the single instance in which *daghesh lene* is omitted after a silent sheva. See GREEN, § 22 *b*; 66 (2), *a*; BÖTT., § 325.—A.]

Ver. 10.—[In אֲדֹנָו the suffix is of the form appropriate to the singular, as is not uncommon with *pluralia tantum*; BÖTT., § 886, 1, *b*. In יְקַלֶּלְךָ the verb has the sense of a subj. pres. in a negative or final clause; BÖTT., § 981, 2.—A.]

Vers. 15.—[The noun הוֹן, as a sort of independent accusative, becomes virtually an Interjection. BÖTTCHER, § 510, 5, *d*.—A.]

Ver. 17.—[לִיקְּהַת for לִיקְהַת has a *daghesh dirimens* in the ק, the long Hhiriq being shortened; GREEN, § 14, *a*; 24, *b*; 57, 2, (3) *a*; BÖTT., § 399, *b*, 3; 458, 1, *d*.—A.]

Ver. 25.—[נְמָלִים, a fem. noun construed as masculine; GREEN, § 200, *e*; BÖTT., § 715, *c*.—A.]

Ver. 29.—[מֵיטְבֵי, where it occurs the second time, drops the characteristic ' as superfluous; BÖTT., § 171.—A.]

Ver. 31.—[For אוֹ BÖTT. would read הָאוֹ, the wild goat or antelope.]

EXEGETICAL.

1. *Preliminary Remark.* If our reading and explanation of the superscription in ver. 1 is correct (see what is said immediately below, under No. 2), the contents of this Supplement, like that of the one following (chap. xxxi. 1-9), can be accepted neither as from Solomon, nor from Hezekiah. For aside from the fact that it is quite as impossible that "Agur" as that "Lemuel" in chap. xxxi. 1 is some allegorical substitute for the name of Solomon, as many of the olden commentators claim (*e. g.*, STÖCKER, J. LANGE, *etc.*, [so JEROME, RASHI, *etc.*, earlier, and WORDSW., *etc.*, more recently]), the name Massa clearly points to a land beyond the bounds of Palestine as the dwelling-place of the author or collector. The name must belong to the Massa mentioned in Gen. xxv. 14; 1 Chron. i. 30 with Duma, as the name of a district or tribe in northern Arabia,—which from the direction of Jerusalem (according to Is. xxi. 11) was beyond Seir, and therefore in any case south-easterly from Palestine, and which we shall be obliged to regard as an Ishmaelitish kingdom, or an Israelitish founded by members of the covenant people of the Old Testament who had wandered from home. DELITZSCH holds the former view (Article *Sprüche Salomo's* in HERZOG's *Real-Encyclopädie*). His reasons are, that both sections, the "words of Agur" and the "words of Lemuel" contain numerous traces of an origin outside the Hebrew while yet Semitic (*e.g.*, the insatiable "Aluka" or blood-sucker, chap. xxx. 15; the Divine name אֱלוֹהַ, chap. xxx. 15; the expressions יִקְּהָה, xxx. 1, 17; הוֹן "enough," xxx. 15, 16; בַּר (בְּרִי), xxxi. 2; אֵין=אֵי, xxxi. 4; בְּנֵי עֹנִי, xxxi. 5, *etc.*); and because the reception into the canon of the prophecies of Balaam, and yet more that of the discourses of Job, a dweller in the land of Uz, which notoriously was never inhabited by Israelites, furnish proofs sufficiently weighty of the possibility of a transplanting into the soil of the sacred national literature of Israel, of the products of a religious literature originating beyond the bounds of Israel. The second of the views above mentioned HITZIG has endeavored to present as probable in his treatise on "the kingdom of Massa" (1844), already cited in § 12 of our Introduction, and likewise in pp. 310 sq. of his Commentary; and he has done it with arguments which we must deem more weighty than those adduced by DELITZSCH, and whose decisive weight is admitted by BERTHEAU also. These arguments for the Israelitish character of the land of Massa, and of its rulers Agur and Lemuel, whose wise maxims are before us in our two Supplements, are briefly the following. 1) Agur confesses expressly in chap. xxx. 9 his faith in Jehovah the God of Israel. 2) The introductory words in xxx. 1-6, as well as the utterances in vers. 7, 8, 14, 22, 32 of the same chapter, and in chap. xxxi. 8, 9, breathe forth that sense of justice and that humble subjection to the hand of God, which are peculiar to the theocratic reverer of the law who is of Israel, and such as appear in numerous other passages of our Book of Proverbs, of the Book of Psalms, the Prophets, *etc.* 3) The Massa of Gen. xxv. 14; 1 Chron. i. 30, is indeed in these passages numbered among the sons of Ishmael, and therefore characterized as a district inhabited mainly by Ishmaelites; but later Arabian and Jewish authors (especially BENJAMIN of Tudela in his accounts of the city of Telmâs see RITTER's Arabia, II. 406) describe the region of Massa and the Duma which is its near neighbor, as occupied by numerous Jews,—and already among the prophecies of Isaiah from the time of Hezekiah there is found a prophecy which relates to Duma (Is. xxi. 11, 12), a "burden of Duma" which with great probability presents Hebrews as dwelling in this region. 4) The passage (1 Chron. iv. 38-43) expressly records a migration that occurred in the days of Hezekiah to Mount Seir, and so quite into the neighborhood of Massa and Duma,—a migration of Israelites of the tribe of Simeon who had settled in the region of the remnant of the Amalekites, and therefore in northern Arabia; and moreover from Micah i. 15; ii. 8-10; Is. xxviii. 12 there may be inferred as probable a considerable advanced movement of certain roving Israelites toward the South, as having occurred about that time. Therefore Agur and Lemuel might very probably be regarded as Arabian-Israelitish shepherd princes, or as kings (Emirs, Captains) of a colony of Israelites of the tribes of Simeon that had emigrated to northern Arabia,—and this Simeonite colony Massa, quite like Job's "land of Uz," should be conceived of as a district to a great extent if not chiefly occupied by kinsmen of the Old Testament people of God, who were believers in Jehovah. [BÖTT. in his *Lehrb.*, has

Digitized by Google

of course no occasion to enter into the details of this discussion. He does, however, § 29, 36, 37, refer to these chapters as probably largely of Simeonitish origin, and cites various words and constructions as plainly showing affinity with and the influence of the cognate Arabic and Aramaic dialects. STUART (*Comm.* pp. 401-407) enters very elaborately into the examination of the arguments for and against the generally received conception and construction, and decides strongly in favor of HITZIG's view, which our author adopts. Nearly every other English and American interpreter dismisses the subject with a few lines, quietly retaining the rendering of the E. V. possibly with slight modifications. KAMPH. rejects this part of HITZIG's theory while agreeing with it in many other points. BLEEK admits its possible correctness.—A.]

2. The superscription to the discourses of Agur, ver. 1, according to the Masoretic punctuation is literally rendered: Words of Agur, the son of Jakeh, the divine utterance (prophetic utterance), the saying of the man to Ithiel, to Ithiel and Ucal." Inasmuch as of the four proper names which these words include, according to this conception of them, one at least, Ithiel, appears also in Neh. xi. 7 as an Israelitish name of a man, and since Agur is not to be at all suspected as a Hebrew personal name, whether we interpret the word (with HERDER and the majority) by "collector," and so regard it a collateral form of אֹגֵר (Prov. x. 5),—or whether with HITZIG, following the Arabic, we claim for it the signification "exile, the man living in a strange land," this interpretation of this difficult passage, which was already given in the Chaldee version, and partially in the Syriac, and has been retained by most moderns, seems to excite no suspicion, *if it be assumed* that we are to regard Ithiel and Ucal as sons or pupils of Agur, and are to conceive of the whole as the communication, not indeed of a dialogue of the teacher Agur with these pupils (so *e. g.*, DÖDERLEIN), but of a didactic address, or a "fatherly counsel" given to them. But this conception is lexically impossible. And 1) because neither "Jakeh" nor "Ucal" occurs elsewhere as a Hebrew proper name, nor can they even be satisfactorily explained as such (see HITZIG on this passage); [FUERST taking Jakeh as an irregular participial form interprets it symbolically "one holding to the assembly of the wise;"—GESEN. more concisely "pious"]. 2) Because the remarkable doubling of לְאִיתִיאֵל can in no way be brought into harmony with the laws of the Hebrew modes of expression,—not even by the assumption of HERDER and UMBREIT that this is a solemn repetition produced "by the vehemence of parallelism." 3) Because, finally, הַמַּשָּׂא in the sense of "prophetic utterance, prophetic burden" would in connection with the following נְאֻם give a combination unknown in the whole prophetical literature of the Old Testament,—one to the justification of which neither Zech. ix. 1; xii. 1, nor any other passage whatsoever can be brought. [KAMPH. while admitting that only a greater or less degree of probability can at the best be reached, meets this difficulty by separating the two nouns whose combination is pronounced unexampled. The first he connects with Agur, while admitting the term is elsewhere used only in strict prophecy. The second he regards as describing the "utterance" of "the man," some friend or stranger, whose words are given in vers. 1-4, while Agur himself begins to speak in ver. 5. He fails to find any sufficient reason for taking מַשָּׂא as a proper rather than a common noun. STUART argues that in xxxi. 1 מַשָּׂא must be a genitive limiting מֶלֶךְ, no other construction being grammatical; the noun must therefore be a proper noun, the name of the kingdom, and the noun must be presumed to be the same here.—A.]

The allegorizing interpretations are however likewise untenable, which have been attempted in various forms, taking the four proper names as either wholly or partially appellative. This was early done by the LXX and Vulg., the former of which appears to have regulated the text in a way wholly arbitrary, while the latter follows the text more closely, and renders Agur by *congregans*, Jakeh by *vomens*, Ithiel by *cum quo est Deus*, and Jucal by *confortatus*. Of modern expositors EWALD has taken at least the last half of the ver. in a similar way: Thus does the man speak to God-with-me, to God-with-me and I-am-strong. The אֻכָל according to this view stands for אוּכַל, and in combination with the appellative Ithiel composes a single name. Instead of נְאֻם however we should need to read נָאֻם. Since the objections expressed above, especially those which relate to the name Jakeh, and the doubling of the name Ithiel are not removed, and still others are added to them, there is nothing left but to alter the reading of the verse thoroughly. Of the various emendations which are possible and have been in part already attempted, that of HITZIG commends itself most strongly, which we have made the basis of the version given above.

According to this we should in the first place read בֶּן יִקָּהָהּ מַשָּׂא "Son of her whom Massa obeys," or again בֶּן יִקְהָהּ מַשָּׂא (which is equivalent to בֶּן יִקְהָתָהּ מַשָּׂא) "Son of her whose dominion is Massa," which in any case gives as the result "son of the ruler, the princess of Massa" (comp. No. 1.)

Furthermore we must then read twice לָאִיתִי אֵל, "I have labored, have wearied myself upon, about. with God," *i. e.*, have sought with difficulty and effort to conceive and comprehend Him in His nature (comp. נִלְאָה in Is. xvi. 12; and also passages like Job xi. 7; Acts xvii. 27, *etc.*) Finally the concluding word ואכל must either be pointed וָאֻכָל, "and have become dull, am wearied," *i. e.*, in seeking after God (thus HITZIG); or, which seems to be lexically easier, וָאֵכֶל (from כלה, *evanuit*) "and have withdrawn, have become faint" (comp. Ps. lxix. 4; lxxxiv. 3; Job xix. 27, *etc.*), which latter reading is the one followed by BERTHEAU [KAMPH., S., *etc.*]. It is, indeed, true that even by these emendations the

difficulties of the passage are not removed; and yet the meaning thus resulting for the second half of the verse agrees admirably with the further utterances of the Introduction, especially with vers. 3 and 4. Moreover the *οὐ παύομαι* of the LXX which corresponds with the ואכל at the end confirms on the whole the interpretation given to that obscure expression (and that of HITZIG as well as that of BERTHEAU, which besides are not essentially different). And as respects the expression, which is, it is true, somewhat harsh, בן יקהה מי, an indirect confirmation of this appears in the fact that the rare word יִקְּהָה "obedience" (comp. Gen. xlix. 10) occurs again immediately below in ver. 17.

3. Vers. 2-6. Continuation and conclusion of the Introduction.—**For I am a beast and not a man,** *etc.* To the confession given at the outset, that he has wearied himself in vain in fathoming the divine nature, there is here appropriately added the admission of the author's ignorance, and his natural incapacity for higher spiritual knowledge. His vexation in view of the fact that his wisdom has come to shame in connection with God and things divine, finds vent for itself in strong expressions, which remind us of Ps. lxxiii. 22; comp. also remarks above on chap. xii. 1.—בַּעַר מֵאִישׁ is probably not "more stupid than any man" (as is commonly rendered, EWALD, BERTHEAU [E. V., DE W., H., N., S., M., W., K.] *etc.*), but "brutishly stupid, unlike (away from) a man," and so "a beast and not a man" (HITZIG). [We see no reason for preferring this to the common comparative rendering of מִן. A.]

Ver. 3. **Nor gained knowledge of the Holy.** For this last clause comp. remarks on ix. 10.

Ver. 4. **Who hath ascended to the heavens and descended?** For the form of words here employed comp. Gen. xxviii. 12; also John iii. 13; Rom x. 6, 7. The ascending to heaven and descending thence, is like the "grasping the wind in the fists," the wrapping up the waters, *etc.*, an activity belonging exclusively to God, and characteristic of Him in His supermundane nature. That there is an activity of this sort, ruling the world and upholding the world, on the part of the invisible God, he knows; but who the invisible divine Ruler of all is, and how constituted, this has hitherto remained hidden from his view, and it is to this that his amazed inquiries relate, reminding us of Job xxvi. 14; Is. xl. 12, *etc.*—**Who gathereth the wind in his fists?**—so that he can at his pleasure restrain it and let it blow. בְּחָפְנָיו, lit. "in his two fists;" an expression employed probably because there are always two opposing currents of wind, of which now the one and again the other blows (comp. Eccles. i. 6.) [There seems to be no occasion for going beyond the fact that fists usually exist in pairs, to find in the remoter facts of nature an explanation for a very natural phrase.—A.]—**Who wrappeth the waters in a garment?** The water is the upper mass of waters, wrapped in the clouds of heaven as in a capacious garment, and so kept back from pouring down upon the earth. Comp. Job xxvi. 8; Ps. civ. 6: and above, notes on Prov. viii. 28.—**Who fixeth all the ends of the earth?** By this is probably intended the bounds of the continents against the sea (Jer. v. 22; Job xxxiii. 10, 11.)—**What is his name, and his son's name, if thou knowest?** In this question is contained the idea: No one knows God adequately, in His inmost nature; none is able to attain a genealogical knowledge of Him and His family, in such way as may be done among men; especially is the question, what is true of His son, veiled in inscrutable mystery. That God *has no son at all* is plainly not implied in this remarkable question, which is left unanswered (in reply to HITZIG); but only this, that no one knows the name of this son,—that his nature and his relation to the other manifestations of God's nature, *e. g.*, to His hypostatic wisdom (chap. viii. 22 sq.) is known to none. Agur therefore confesses here with sufficient distinctness the defectiveness of his knowledge of God the Son,—a fact which serves to confirm in the most welcome way our remarks on the passage viii. 22 sq. concerning the incompleteness, the embryonic imperfection of the doctrine of the Logos (or the Christology) of the proverbs in general. Both GEIER who identifies the "Son" of our passage without qualification with God's hypostatic wisdom, and J. D. MICHAELIS, who finds here ascribed to God with the clearness and precision of the New Testament an only Son, go too far and intermingle foreign ideas. [So STUART: "To think of the *Logos* here, under the name of בֵּן would be 'travelling very far out of the record.'" And yet we may well go as far as J. PYE SMITH (*Scripture Testimony, etc.*, I 469) when he says: "The concluding clauses of this energetic passage are rationally and easily interpreted, if we admit that the ancient Jews had some obscure ideas of a plurality in the divine nature." The objections to as much of an inference as this are forced and feeble. It is *possible* that the meaning may be only this: We know neither himself nor his,—while in human relations the man and his genealogy are objects of eager inquiry and extensive knowledge. But the Messianic Psalms had already spoken of "the Son," mysteriously, perhaps, and yet enough to supply germs of knowledge as well as of faith. See HOLDEN, *etc.*—A.]—Strangely insipid and rationalizing is UMBREIT's view [held by NOYES, *etc.*], that by the Son is here intended the pupil of the philosopher who understands all the mysteries of the world and the world's government!—Furthermore the LXX instead of בְּנוֹ must have read בָּנָיו for they render *ἢ το ὄνομα τοῖς τέκνοις αὐτοῦ.*

Vers. 5, 6. Instead of unprofitable puzzling about God and divine mysteries there is recommended the humble reception in faith of the only true divine revelation which affords light and peace, and needs no supplementing or perfecting on the part of man.—With 5 *a* comp. Ps. xix. 9; cxix. 140; with *a* and *b*, Ps. xviii. 31, where however יְהוָֹה takes the place of the divine name אֱלוֹהַּ which is characteristic of our passage. In regard to this comp. above, remarks under No. 1.—**Add thou nothing to His words.** A similar warning with respect to the law as a

Digitized by Google

revelation of the divine will fully sufficient in itself and adequate occurs in Deut. iv. 2; xii. 32; comp. also Rev. xxii. 18.

4. Vers. 7-10. Prayer of the poet to Jehovah for preservation from all that is false, and from the two extremes of poverty and riches (vers. 7-9), together with a warning against the vice of slander. This last forms with ver. 17 the sole exception to that mode of constructing the proverbs which elsewhere in the section, vers. 7-33, is consistently carried through, *viz.*, the numerical. Comp. on these peculiar numerical proverbs or *Middoth*, the Introd., § 14, and remarks on chap. vi. 16.—**Two things have I entreated of thee.** This double prayer is, as the 2d clause shows, a prayer not merely once offered, but the abiding utterance to God of the desire of the poet's heart, his importunate request from Him continued to his death.

Ver. 8. **Deceit and lies keep far from me.** "Deceit" (שָׁוְא) and "lying words" stand in the mutual relation of the devising of inward untruth and deceitful wickedness, and the false, lying utterance which springs forth from this as its necessary expression. No further justification is added for this first half of the prayer; the second, however, which relates to the golden mean between rich and poor, is more minutely explained and justified in ver. 8, *c* and ver. 9. [The idea "vanity" given in the E. V. and retained by H., M., W., *etc.*, is a secondary meaning of the noun whose primary meaning according to GESEN. is "evil," according to FUERST "insecurity, or slipperiness." It seems to be more than the unsubstantial, it is the positively deceitful that is here intended.—A.]—**Cause me to eat the food allotted me,** lit. "the food of my lot or portion," *i. e.*, the part or assignment that falls to me, so much as is intended and is needful for me, no more and no less. Comp. xxxi. 15; Gen. xlvii. 22; and also the ἄρτος ἐπιούσιος, the "daily bread" of the Lord's prayer, Matth. vi. 11, which is equivalent at least in a general way.

Ver. 9. **Lest I being full deny,** *etc.* Bold denial of the Holy One, and the mocking question "who is the Lord, or what can He do?" (comp. Ps. lxxiii. 11; Job xxi. 14) appears in other passages likewise as the indication of pride developed by surfeiting and luxurious enjoyment in life; see Deut. viii. 12-15; xxxii. 15 sq.—**And lest I be poor and steal** (comp. vi. 30) **and take the name of my God in vain.** תפשׂ "to lay hands upon or seize hold of something" here denotes the wicked profanation of the divine name which consists in mockery, cursing and contumely with respect to it. For such offences as these the bitter necessities of hunger and poverty may according to Isa. viii. 21 produce (comp. Prov. xix. 3), and not merely false swearing by the name of God in denying the guilt of theft, which alone is usually thought of here.

Ver. 10. **Cause not the servant to slander his master.** Usually rendered: "betray (or slander) not the servant to his master" (Vulg., LUTHER, UMBREIT [E. V., DE W., H., N., M.], *etc.*). But the Hiphil cannot have the same meaning as the Poel, Ps. ci. 5; it must mean "to cause one to slander, to excite one to calumny against another." The warning is not against slander in itself, but against incitement to slander, and more specifically betraying servants into tattling and accusations against their masters (thus correctly EWALD, BERTHEAU, HITZIG, ELSTER [KAMPH, S.], *etc*).—**Lest he curse thee, and thou be destroyed.** The instigator to slander might easily hit upon the wrong person, a faithful, diligent servant, who instead of allowing himself to be misled, might rather curse the betrayer, and so bring merited calamity upon his head (comp. remarks on xxvi. 2).

5. Vers. 11-14. An utterance expressive of execration, vehement abhorrence, concerning a people or a generation characterized by four forms of ungodliness (not *quatuor genera detestabilia hominum,* as J. D. MICHAELIS and others hold). The דּוֹר which is four times repeated, may be taken either as a vocative, "Oh generation!" (EWALD, ELSTER), or as a nominative, which then expresses simply the existence of a generation of the kind described, and is used in a certain sense for יֵשׁ דּוֹר (LUTHER, E. V., *etc.* "There is a generation").—**A generation that curseth their father,** *etc.* Comp. chap. xx. 20; Ex. xxi. 17; and then with respect to ver. 12; Isa. iv. 4; with reference to ver. 13, Isa. x. 12; Ps. cxxxi. 2; Prov. vi. 17.—**And their eyelids are lifted up!** HITZIG finds in this exclamation, which appears at first to be only a rhetorically expanded parallel to "the loftiness of the eyes" in clause *a*, an allusion to the name עֲמָלֵק Amalek, which in the Arabic signifies "one looking with wide open eyes, a man with eyelids lifted up or painted." He therefore conjectures that the entire delineation of a reckless generation here before us refers to the people of the Amalekites, whose deadly national hatred toward the children of Israel (the "needy or poor," ver. 14 *b*) and whose warlike love of plunder are described in ver. 14 especially. With the assumption that Agur is the prince of a colony of Simeonites, Massa, founded in the Amalekite territory (see remarks above, No. 1), this hypothesis would admirably agree, on account of 1 Chron. iv. 53. And yet the conjecture is in itself too uncertain, and particularly too little established on the linguistic side.—With ver. 14 *a* comp. Ps. lvii. 5; lviii. 7; with *b*, Jer. v. 17; xxx. 16; l. 17; Isa. ix. 12, *etc.* [WORDSW. with his fondness for allegorizing finds in these "four evil generations" an undoubted reference to spiritual mysteries, *e. g.*, various offences within and against the church.—A.].

6. Vers. 15, 16. Of four kinds of insatiable things.—**The leech hath two daughters; Give, give!** The rare name Aluka (עֲלוּקָה) the old versions (the LXX, SYMM., the Venet., Vulg.) render by βδέλλη, *sanguisuga*, with which there should undoubtedly be taken into account the fact that *galukâ* or *galokâ* in the Indian is the name of the blood-sucker, and that essentially the same word (عَلُوق) is in Arabic the designation of a ghostly demon (or according to Camus, possibly of a ravenous wolf). And this is the more confirmed by the fact that the

Digitized by Google

Targ. on Ps. xii. 9 speaks of "an Aluka going about in a circle, and sucking from men their blood," and by this is undoubtedly meant a vampyre-like spirit, a ghostly monster of the nature of the *ghouls* of the Arabs and Persians, or the Indian *dakini* (which congregate in graveyards, and live on the flesh and bones of the corpses). An Indian origin of the conception described by "Aluka" is indicated also by the occurrence of a proverb closely related to our own, with reference to the insatiableness of four things, in the *Hitopadesa* (ed. LASSEN, p. 66): "The fire is not sated with wood, nor the great sea with the streams; nor the god of death with all the living, nor the beautiful-eyed with men." The similarity of this Indian maxim to our passage is clearly much more significant, than that of the Arabic proverb in MEIDANI, III. 64, where only "death not to be satisfied with creatures, and fire not to be satisfied with wood" make up the objects compared. The assumption of a derivation both of the name Aluka, and of the entire proverb in its essential substance from the old Indian literature need the less excite any well-founded suspicion, since Agur's residence, Massa, doubtless lay quite near to the old highway of caravans leading from India and Persia to Petra and Teima, and on this Sabæan and other merchants will have brought, not only Indian articles of traffic, but Indian ideas and literary productions to the lands of South Western Asia (comp. HITZIG, p. 313). But the name Aluka and the proverb as a whole is conceived with substantial correctness by DÖDERLEIN and ZEIGLER, whom afterward GESEN., UMBREIT, HITZIG, BERTHEAU, DELITZSCH, and in general most of the recent interpreters have followed. [For illustration supplied by travellers in Palestine, see THOMSON's *Land and Book*, I. 368, and WOOD's *Bible Animals*, p. 646.—A.].

We must reject as untenable both JARCHI's interpretation of "Aluka" by Sheol, hell (so rendered in alleged accordance with the Arabic), and BOCHART's assertion, that the word signifies fate, μοῖρα, insatiable destiny. In this latter view there is only so much of truth, that "Aluka" does indeed appear generalized to a conception of quite a comprehensive sort, so far forth, plainly, as "personified insatiableness, craving in its highest intensity" (BERTHEAU) is denoted by it. Therefore, it appears also as a female spirit, and has two daughters ascribed to it. These two "daughters of the blood-sucker" are in the first instance designated by a double "give," in accordance with their character as craving, insatiable natures, and these are also expressly mentioned by name. For it is plainly these that are meant by the first two of the four insatiable things, which are named in vs. 16 *a* as "Sheol" and the "barren womb." Hell, or the kingdom of the dead, is also in Isaiah v. 14, as well as above in chap. xxvii. 20, personified as a spiritual power that with insatiable greediness gathers men to itself. The "closing of the "womb" (for עֹצֶר comp. Gen. xvi. 2; xx. 18), *i. e.*, the unfruitful womb of woman, in connection with which there is no conception and bearing of children, gives indications of itself, according to what is said in Gen. xxx. 1 sq. of Jacob's wives, likewise in an insatiable craving, in constant desire for sexual enjoyments. On this second example of insatiableness the most weight seems to be laid by the author of the proverb (comp. chap. xxvii. 20). He does not, however, externally distinguish it specially, and assigns it a prominent place in the series of his enumerations only by making it together with "hell" emphatically the daughter of the blood-sucker, while the "earth" as a third, and the "fire" as a fourth example he simply allows to follow in a subordinate place. The whole sentence evidently lacks the symmetrical, simply and clearly organized structure, which distinguishes the analogous Indian proverb above cited. Yet in this fact that just that which is the main thought, or the truth in the moral world among men which is to be illustrated by the associated similes from nature, the insatiableness of the craving of the barren woman, is pushed on to the second place, and so in a sense hidden (unlike the order in that Sanscrit proverb where the never satisfied "beautiful-eyed" are emphatically placed at the end), there is with the greatest probability involved a fully conscious intention of the author of the proverb, who wished by this artifice to give to his maxim the heightened charm of ingenuity, and to form, instead of a mere numerical proverb, a sharp enigmatical proverb (a חִידָה, comp. Introd., § 11, note 2). Of these numerical proverbs which are at the same time enigmas, our chapter contains several besides, especially vers. 18–20; vers. 24–28; and vers. 29–31. [As compared with the numerical proverbs that follow, the complexity and the more artificial character of the one before us at once arrests attention. They all have this in common, that whatever moral lesson they have to convey is less obvious, being hinted rather than stated, and in this view they may merit the name "enigmas." In the one now under consideration insatiable desire and the importance of its regulation seem to be the remote object. In the development, instead of the "three things" and "four things" which repeatedly appear afterward, we have the "leech," its two daughters, the three and the four. Some have regarded the two daughters as representing physical characteristics of the blood-sucker,—others as expressing by an Orientalism a doubly intense craving. Parallelism suggests making the first two of the four the two daughters apart from other considerations; other allusions of the Scriptures to the greediness of the world of the dead, justify the first, while the second alone belongs to human nature. We can see no other reason than this for making the second the most emphatic of the four as Z. is disposed to do.—Only the most unnatural theory of inspiration can take exception to the suggestion of a possible Indian origin for the substance and the external form of this proverb, its place and form here being secured by an appropriate and adequate influence of the Holy Spirit. The Book of Proverbs applies a very severe test to some theories of inspiration.—A.]

7. Ver. 17. The punishment of him who sins against his parents;—an ethical maxim introduced without any close connection into the series of the "Middoth" in our section, as ver. 10 is above. EWALD would have the insatiableness of the birds of prey, which are to execute the judgment on the

Digitized by Google

wicked man, regarded as the main idea of the proverb, connecting it with vers. 15, 16. This element, however, is plainly too far in the background, and the main thought is rather his desert of curse and penalty who daringly tramples under foot the fifth commandment; and from this there is a sort of connection with vers. 11-14.—**An eye . . . . the ravens of the valley** (lit., brook) (comp. 1 Kings xvii. 4-6) **shall pluck it out**, *etc.* [The נחל, the Arabic Wady, is sometimes the torrent, sometimes the valley through which it flows. See full illustrations and citations in STANLEY'S *Palestine*, p. 496.—A.]—The "raven" and the "eagle" (*i. e.*, vulture) are named here as birds that feed upon carrion; the "sons of the eagle," *i. e.*, the young eagles, are named because it is especially upon sons, wayward sons, it is true, that the penalty is to be inflicted. The punishment itself, however, consists in strangling and leaving the bodies unburied, so that they become food for the fowls of heaven; comp. 1 Sam. xvii. 44; 1 Kings xiv. 11; xvi. 4, *etc.*—[With reference to the raven consult WOOD'S *Bible Animals*, p. 445; and to the eagle or griffin vulture, p. 346.—A.]

8. Vers. 18-20. Four incomprehensible things. —**The way of the eagle in the heavens**, *etc.*—Besides the ease with which the eagle, a large and heavy bird, soars high above in the air (comp. Job xxxix. 27), this circumstance is also surely an object of the poet's amazement, that it leaves behind no trace of its course; for the same thing is also true of the progress of the smoothly gliding serpent over the slippery rock, and also of that of the ship that swiftly ploughs the waves of the sea. Of the fourth of the ways here compared, the "way of the man with the maid" (or "in the maid"), *i. e.*, of the mysterious way in which the man in sexual intercourse has fruitful connection with the maid, this failure to leave any trace behind seems indeed to be less true. And yet the author in this connection doubtless thinks not of pregnancy and the woman's child-bearing as later results of sexual connection, but as ver. 20 shows, at first only of this, that the intercourse leaves behind it no traces immediately and directly apparent; man and wife, adulterer and adulteress, can the night following the accomplishment of the mysterious process be convicted of it by no one; the act is as little to be detected in them both as eating in him who after table has wiped his mouth (ver. 20, *b*, *c*). Moreover, the woman in ver. 19 is designated as עַלְמָה, *i. e.*, as *virgo pubescens*, as a young woman capable of sexual intercourse (comp. Gen. xxiv. 43; Is. vii. 14; Song Sol. vi. 8), undoubtedly for this reason, that she is to be put in contrast with the adulterous woman in ver. 20; in other words, the sexual intercourse between man and woman is to be described first in its pure and normal type (the first love of the bridegroom and the bride, comp. Gen. ii. 24; Eph. v. 31, 32; John iii. 29), and only afterwards in its degenerate form as adultery. Furthermore, the "Alma" of our passage has been in many ways interpreted also of the Virgin Mary, *e. g.*, by AMBROSE, LYRA, CORN. A LAPIDE, and FR. GRISENIUS (in LÖSCHER'S "*Unsch. Nachrichten*," Vol. 13, p. 503) [and also by WORDSW. *in loco*].—DATHE has very unnecessarily been disposed to regard ver. 20 as a spurious addition by a later hand. It is not even necessary (with HITZIG) to regard the verse as a later addition coming from Agur himself, which he "had not originally had in view."

9. Vers. 21-23. Four intolerable things under which the earth trembles (not "the land," as LUTHER, UMBREIT, BERTHEAU, *etc.*, render, weakening the sense). With ver. 21 comp. Am. ii. 13; vii. 10.—**Under a servant when he becometh ruler.**—This is the first and most familiar example, by which the moral danger, and even the ruinous consequences of a sudden elevation of men from a depressed condition to an influential station and unwonted prosperity, are illustrated.—**And a fool when he is satisfied with bread.**—The "becoming surfeited" is usually attended by a becoming insolent (see ver. 9), especially in the case of a fool to whom not satiety but hunger is properly becoming (chap. xiii. 25; Job xxvii. 14).

Ver. 23. Under a **hated woman when she is married.** By the "hated woman" is meant, not one who is "odious," "worthy of hate" (ROSENM., [E. V., H., N., S., M.,]), nor again a woman already married and only neglected and disparaged by her husband (DATHE, UMBREIT,), but, as appears from the "when she is married, when she obtains a husband," one who has remained waiting, the maiden (old maid) who at first could obtain no husband, but afterward when she has been married triumphs insolently, and deals harshly and contemptuously with her sisters or companions who are single (comp. Gen. xxix. 31, 33; Deut. xxi. 15-17.) The same will be the conduct, according to clause *b* of a maid "when she becomes heir to her mistress," *i. e.*, undoubtedly, when she supplants her mistress in the favor of her husband, and so becomes his all-powerful favorite.

10. Vers. 24-28. The four things that are small and yet wise (with respect to מְחֻכָּמִים, made wise or quick of wit, comp. Ps. lviii. 6; lxiv. 7). Four species of small animals are thus described, which in spite of their comparatively diminutive size and strength of body, yet by virtue of their diligence (ver. 25), shrewdness (ver. 26), harmony (ver. 27), and flexibility (ver. 28) serve as instructive emblems for the domestic, social and political life of men.—With ver. 25 comp. vi. 7, 8.—For the "conies" (Z. "cliff-badgers") in ver. 26, *i. e.*, the *hyrax Syriacus* which live in companies in Syria, Palestine and Arabia Petræa (not the marmot, the *mus sive dipus jaculus*, comp. LINNÆUS, or the rabbit, as LUTHER renders the word, following the Chald. and the Rabbins), see Ps. civ. 18; Lev. xi. 5; Deut. xiv. 7. [See THOMSON'S *Land and Book*, I. 459, and also WOOD'S *Bible Animals*, pp. 312-18; and for his illustration of the nature and habits of the ant of Palestine, pp. 616-22; for the locusts see pp. 596-604; and for the gecko, a species of lizard which he understands to be referred to in ver. 28 instead of the "spider," see pp. 643, 534 sq. A.]—For the "organized going forth" of the locusts, in ver. 27, comp. especially Joel ii. 2 sq., [and THOMSON, *Land and Book*, II. 109]. Finally the lizard in ver. 28 is as its name signifies the poisonous spotted lizard (*stellio*, Vulg.) in regard to which the thing here made prominent is

Digitized by Google

its sly entering into the interior of houses, and even into the palaces of the great. For this characteristic of the animal BOCHART brings forward various testimonies, *Hieroz.*, I. iv. 7, p. 1090, Frankfort Ed. [GESENIUS, FUERST, *etc.*, favor this rendering, and WOOD (*ubi supra*) describes and depicts the peculiar form of the feet by which the lizard, the Gecko, "layeth hold" even upon flat surfaces like the walls of apartments.—A.]

11. Ver. 29-31. The four creatures that have a stately movement; three animals, and the king in his all-ruling dignity and power. The whole description really turns upon the last.

Ver. 31. **The greyhound, slender in its loins.** This is the probable meaning of the difficult phrase זַרְזִיר מָתְנַיִם (according to the Jewish interpreters, EWALD, BERTHEAU, [E. V., S., M.,] *etc.*). For זַרְזִיר is plainly derived from the root זַר "to compress," and therefore denotes a compact, slender animal; and the neighboring term seems to indicate the intention not to bring together exclusively examples of animal majesty of the high rank of the lion, but to give to the enumeration as a whole in a certain sense a ludicrous variety and an air of wit. The old versions (LXX, Vulg., Targ., *etc.*,) suggest the *cock;* with this meaning of the main noun the modifying term, however, does not at all agree, even though one were disposed to transform it into a Hithp. Part. מִתְהַנִּים. Others, like SCHULTENS, GESEN. (?), UMBREIT, ELSTER, HITZIG [DE W., K., MUFFET, N.] take the זַרְזִיר in the sense of "that which is girded about the loins, or panoplied," and therefore the *war-horse*,—a meaning however which is not surely demonstrable. [Starting with the same idea WORDSW. understands a "warrior," and WOOD an "athlete." FUERST's rendering is "stag"].—**And a king with whom no resistance** (occurs). In this way (with the Vulg., the Rabbins, GEIER, MICHAELIS, BERTHEAU, EWALD, [K., E. V., H., S., M.], *etc.*), we must interpret the words אַלְקוּם עִמּוֹ, although the אַל־מָוֶת of chap. xii. 28 is a very doubtful parallel for this way of regarding אַלְקוּם as a compound of אַל and קוּם. For the identification of this noun with the Arabic الْقَوْم "the people" (CASTELLIO, POCOCKE, UMBREIT, [DE W., N.], *etc.*), an argument might seem to lie in the fact that the meaning so reached, "the king at the head of his people," agrees almost literally with the δημηγορῶν ἐν ἔθνει of the LXX, and the similar version of the Syriac. But to bring in an Arabic word, especially one compounded with the article *al* is here quite too unnatural. HITZIG's emendation might better recommend itself, אֱלֹהִים instead of אַלְקוּם, and all the more because it gives a very pertinent sense: "A king with whom God is."

12. Vers. 32, 33. Warning against pride, haughtiness and love of strife, with an indication of three forms of evil resulting from these vices.—**If thou art foolish in exalting thyself** (comp. 1 Kings i. 5) **and if thou devisest evil.** To these two hypothetical antecedent clauses, which do not present an antithesis (the foolish and rational—as HITZIG explains), but two different forms of human error: foolish self-exaltation and wicked plotting, the sentence "the hand on the mouth," forms the conclusion, interjectional and imperative (comp. Job xx. 5).

Ver. 33 then justifies the warning by a significant intimation of three cases in which the foolish act of "pressing" (מִיץ) brings forth undesirable results,—strong cheese, flowing blood, sharp strife.—**And pressing** (forcing) **wrath produceth strife.** The last word supplies plainly the object of the whole discourse from ver. 32 onward. The dual אַפַּיִם stands doubtless intentionally (comp. Dan. xi. 20) to indicate that it is the wrath of two whose sharp pressing upon each other leads to the development of strife. [THOMSON, *Land and Book*, I. 398, describing the Oriental mode of churning by squeezing and wringing a leathern bag or bottle that contains the milk, makes more apparent and vivid the meaning of this comparison. The dual אַפַּיִם is employed probably because nostrils usually exist in pairs, and the transition is easy from the physical organ, through the heavy breathing of passion, to the metaphorical sense "wrath." Whether two or many are concerned in strife is not material.—A.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

As the confession of an Israelite, a believer in Jehovah in a strange land, one separated from his people of the ten tribes, who among Arabs and the sworn and mortal enemies of Israel, adheres firmly to the faith of his nation, this discourse of Agur is one of great doctrinal importance, and of no slight interest to the history of redemption. Its fundamental idea, which is put forward as a sort of programme, is contained in the six verses of the introduction, and comes out most clearly in ver. 5: Every word of God is pure; a shield is He to them that trust in Him. It is the truth, purity and saving power of the word of God alone, in contrast with the nullity and inadequacy of all human wisdom (vers. 2-5), that forms the starting point in the instructive discourse of this poet of wisdom, and to which all the manifold apothegms, numerical proverbs and enigmas which he combines in a varied series in vers. 7–33, sustain a closer or more remote relation.

While it appears at the first view that the flowers and fruits from the cornucopia of Agur's wisdom, original and in part so rarely fashioned, are heaped up wholly without order, yet they all agree in this, that they depict the glory and all-sufficiency of the word of God, dissuade from adding to it by any human supplements (see in particular ver. 7), and most urgently commend the fulfilling and following it by a pious life. There is hardly a single commandment of the Decalogue that is not directly or indirectly repeated and emphasized in these maxims. Observe the relation of the prayer for the hallowing of God's name (vers. 7-9), to the first and third commandments; the reference contained in ver. 11 and again in ver. 17 to the fifth commandment; the

Digitized by Google

warnings against the transgression of the sixth commandment in ver. 14 as well as in vers. 32, 33; the reproving and warning aim of vers. 18-20, and 23, in their bearing upon the seventh; the allusion to the eighth in ver. 9, and to the ninth in ver. 10; and finally the reference, reminding us of the tenth, in vers. 15, 16, as bearing on the unsatiableness of evil desire (this "daughter of the blood-sucker" and sister of hell!). No one of these proverbs is wholly without an ethical value, not even the two numerical proverbs, vers. 24-28 and 29-31, which at the first view stand apart as incidental reflections on merely natural truths, but in reality hide under their ingenious physical drapery decided moral aims. For in vers. 24-28 four chief virtues of one's social and political avocation are specified through an allusion to a like number of examples from the animal world (comp. exeg. notes, No. 10), and vers. 29-31 run into a delineation of the high dignity and glory of a king by the grace of God (in contrast with the insufferable tyranny of base upstarts, vers. 21-23).

It is true that the point of view taken in the author's doctrinal and ethical knowledge nowhere rises above the level of the pure religion of the law. The law's doctrine of retribution he holds with inexorable strictness and severity, as is indicated particularly in the fearful threatening prediction in ver. 17 against children who are disobedient to their parents (*γονεῦσιν ἀπειθεῖς*, Rom. i. 30). Against those who do not belong to the people of God of the Old Testament he appears to cherish prevailingly dispositions of hate and abhorrence, as the utterance in vers. 11-14, which is probably directed against such non-Israelitish people, shows (see remarks above on this passage). With respect to knowledge in the department of theology and Christology his point of view seems in no respect more elevated than that of the author of chaps. i.-ix.; for in ver. 4 he confesses that he knows nothing of the name of the Son of God, and he nowhere makes reference to the existence and efficiency of the hypostatic wisdom of God, not even where this would have been natural enough (*e. g.* in vers. 4-6). He need not be charged in addition with the intermingling of impure and superstitious notions from polytheistic religions, for the Aluka with its two daughters, in ver. 15, is evidently mentioned by him only with a symbolical design, as a personification of insatiableness (an evil lust that nothing can quell), and is by no means represented as an actually existing spectre, or demoniacal nature.*

HOMILETIC AND PRACTICAL.

Homily on the entire chapter:—The all-sufficient power and the fullness of blessing in the divine word in contrast with the weakness of mere human wisdom: *a*) in general (vers. 1-6); *b*) with special reference to the glory and indispensable necessity of the Decalogue (vers. 7-33); comp. Doctrinal and Ethical notes.—Or again: To God's word and law man is to add nothing (vers. 1-6), but he is also to take nothing away, not even one of its least commandments (vers. 7-33).—STÖCKER: All true wisdom comes from God alone (1-7), not from human nature, which is rather exceedingly corrupt (11-17), and whose understanding is greatly weakened (18-24).

Vers. 1–6. MELANCHTHON: Human wisdom is able to devise no means of preservation from the ignorance and spiritual weakness which naturally belong to us. But the Church in its divine revelation possesses a light which not only reveals to it the causes of its spiritual destitution, but also points out the means for its elevation and healing. Therefore this divinely revealed truth must be listened to by us, must be received in faith as well in its threatenings of punishment as in its consolatory contents, and be guarded from all corruption and perversion.—LUTHER (marginal comment on ver. 2): Wise people know that their wisdom is nothing; fools know everything and cannot err.—GEIER (on vers. 2, 3): With the knowledge of himself and of the deep corruption that dwells in him the Christian must make the beginning in the contemplation of divine things.—[ARNOT: It is a precious practical rule to look toward heaven while we measure ourselves.—TRAPP: Godliness as it begins in right knowledge of ourselves, so it ends in a right knowledge of God.—EDWARDS: All true spiritual knowledge is of that nature that the more a person has of it the more is he sensible of his own ignorance].—STARKE (on vers. 4-6): Whoever is engaged in the investigation and exposition of God's word, let him take his reason captive to the obedience of faith, and not curiously scrutinize, that he may make divine mysteries comprehensible.—STÖCKER (on vers. 5, 6): On the glory of the divine word, especially its clearness, utility and perfectness.—*Berleburg Bible* (on ver. 6); How many counterfeiters there are who from their poor copper make additions to the royal gold currency of God's word, and thereby debase it!—[LAWSON: Our trust must be in the name of the Lord, as it is represented to us in the word of God; the seed and the ground of our faith in Him.—MUFFET: It is treason to corrupt or falsify the prince's coin; what high treason must it needs be then to counterfeit or corrupt the pure word of God!]

Vers. 7–17. Comp. P. GERHARD's poetical reproduction of vers. 7-9: "*Zweierlei bitt' ich von dir," etc.* (*Gesamm. geistliche Lieder*, No. 41).—[TRAPP: God heaps mercies on His suppliants, and blames them for their modesty in asking.—ARNOT: Agur's requests are specific and precise; the temporal interests are absolutely subordinated to the spiritual prosperity of the suppliant; and a watch is set against the danger to a soul which lies in extremes either of position or of character.—BP. HOPKINS: There is a seeking of worldly advantages which is not to be branded with the black mark of self-seeking; *e. g.* when we seek them with a due subordination to the higher and more noble ends of piety and holiness, such as that we may escape those temptations which possibly the want of them might expose us unto.—FLAVEL: How much better were it for thee to endure the pains of hunger than those of a guilty conscience.—BATES: To

* The case appears to be otherwise with the spectre of the night לִילִית mentioned in Isa. xxxiv. 14: comp. DELITZSCH on this passage.

Digitized by Google

receive no hurtful impressions by great changes of condition discovers a habit of excellent grace and virtue in the soul].—Geier: Although poverty and riches of themselves can neither make us blessed nor damn us, yet both are wont incidentally and through the fault of men not rarely to bring after them consequences injurious to our spiritual welfare.—(On ver. 10): Keep thy tongue bridled, especially when it is disposed to rage against the needy and helpless; for though it is not right to curse thy neighbor, yet such curses when they have been uttered do not remain without effect, particularly if he who utters them is one who has been unjustly oppressed.—Starke (on ver. 11-14): The natural corruption of men is great; yet it is possible that they be purged from it by the blood of Jesus Christ; 1 Cor. vi. 11; 1 John i. 7.—Unthankfulness (ver. 11), self-righteousness (ver. 12), pride (ver. 13), and unmercifulness (ver. 14) are usually associated as an unblessed quartette of sisters.—Wohlfarth (on vers. 15, 16): Many are the evil spirits that go about among men to spread misfortune and ruin, the cruel spectre of avarice is one of the most formidable enemies of our race. Like the vampyre which in the night attacks sleepers and sucks their blood, this demon rages in palaces and cottages, *etc.*—(On ver. 17): What Agur here says by way of warning of ravens and vultures, *etc.*, has already gone a thousandfold into literal fulfilment in a horrible way on children who are wayward and in consequence of their disobedience to parents sunk in the deepest spiritual need; who were either driven to self-murder, or died on the scaffold.

Vers. 18–31. Luther (marginal, on ver. 19): Love (the mystery of love, Eph. v. 31, 32) is not to be thought out or expressed.—Geier (on vers. 18-20): As it is with adulterers so it is with flatterers; they will never allow their vicious nature to be called by the right name.—(On vers. 21–23): It always causes manifold disquiet and misfortune, when they rule over others whom it would better befit to be subject to others.—(On vers. 24-28): Despise not things that at the first glance appear small and contemptible. Under a poor garment there is often a wise man hid; Dan. i. 18–20.—(On vers. 29–31): In matters belonging to one's office and public calling it is important to be courageous and firm, especially in times of need. It is not well then if one forsakes those over whom one is set; Ecclesiast. x. 31.—[Lawson (on ver. 20): Do not imagine that the secrecy of sin is your security from punishment; it is the snare of your souls].

Vers. 32, 33. Luther (marginal, on ver. 32): Be not ashamed if thou hast chanced to err, and do not defend it. For to err is human, but to defend it is devilish.—Lange: Strut not with lust of the eyes, fleshly lust and insolence. Thereby thou only provokest the wrath of God, that will come down too heavily for thee; Ecclesiast. v. 2 sq.—*Berleburg Bible:* He that would gladly shun strife must seek to avoid obstinacy and self-will. How many useless disputes in matters of religion might not in this way be escaped!—[Edwards: Silence attends humility.—Muffet: He which falleth through pride should rise again to repentance].

Second Supplement:

The words of Lemuel, together with the poem in praise of the matron.

Chap. XXXI.

a) Lemuel's maxims of wisdom for kings.

Vers. 1–9.

1 **Words of Lemuel the king of Massa**
with which his mother instructed him:
2 Oh, my son! oh, thou son of my womb!
oh thou son of my vows!
3 Give not thy strength to women,
nor thy ways to destroy kings.
4 Not for kings, oh Lemuel,
not for kings (is it becoming) to drink wine;
nor for princes (wine) or strong drink;
5 lest he drink and forget the law,
and pervert the judgment of all the sons of want.
6 Give strong drink to him that is perishing,
and wine to him that is of a heavy heart.
7 Let him drink and forget his poverty,
and let him remember his want no more!

Digitized by Google

8 Open thy mouth for the dumb,
for the right of all orphan children.
9 Open thy mouth, judge righteously,
and vindicate the poor and needy.

b) **Alphabetical song in praise of the virtuous, wise and industrious woman.**

VERS. 10–31.

10 A virtuous woman who can find?
and yet her price is far above pearls.
11 The heart of her husband doth trust in her,
and he shall not fail of gain.
12 She doeth him good and not evil
all the days of her life.
13 She careth for wool and linen,
and worketh with diligent hands.
14 She is like the ships of the merchant,
from afar doth she bring her food.
15 She riseth up while it is yet night,
and giveth food to her house
and a portion to her maidens.
16 She considereth a field and buyeth it,
a vineyard with the fruit of her hands.
17 She girdeth her loins with strength,
and maketh her arms strong.
18 She perceiveth that her gain is good,
her light goeth not out by night.
19 She putteth her hands to the distaff,
and her fingers lay hold on the spindle.
20 She stretcheth forth her hand to the poor,
and extendeth her arms to the needy.
21 She is not afraid of the snow for her household,
for all her household is clothed in crimson.
22 Coverlets doth she prepare for herself;
fine linen and purple is her clothing.
23 Her husband is known in the gates,
when he sitteth with the elders of the land.
24 She maketh fine linen and selleth it,
and girdles doth she give to the merchant.
25 Strength and honor are her clothing;
she laugheth at the future.
26 She openeth her mouth with wisdom,
and the law of kindness is on her tongue.
27 She looketh well to the ways of her household
and the bread of idleness she will not eat.
28 Her sons rise up and praise her,
her husband, he also boasteth of her:
29 Many daughters have done virtuously,
but thou hast excelled them all!
30 Grace is deceitful, beauty is vanity,
a woman that feareth the Lord; let her be praised!
31 Give to her of the fruit of her hands,
and let her works praise her in the gates.

GRAMMATICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 2.—[מַה, where it occurs the third time, is pointed מֶה, as is not uncommon in repetitions, to secure variety; see BÖTT., § 499, *c*. The consonant succeeding is the same in the three cases.—A.]

Ver. 3.—HITZIG changes the לַמְחוֹת (Inf. Hiph. from מחה) to the fem. part. of לכח, "to leer or ogle," לְמֹחוֹת: "and give not thy way to them (the seductive courtesans) who leer after kings" (?). [BÖTT. prefers to make of it a Kal part. fem. plur. from מחה, and would point לְמֹחוֹת and render "the caressers of kings." This is certainly easier than the causative Infinitive with its abstractness. See BÖTT., § 1039, 2. מְלָכִין, an Aramaic form immediately followed in ver. 4 by the regular plural twice repeated. GREEN, § 199, *a*; BÖTT., § 277, 3.—A.]

Ver. 4.—We render אוֹ "or" according to the K'thibh, which is recommended by like examples of a distributive location of this disjunctive particle (such as chap. xxx. 31 [where BÖTT. would read וְאַל rather than allow the irregularity]; Job xxii. 11). We do not need therefore to substitute for it אַו, "desire" (that is, "for strong drink," GESEN. and others), or to read with the K'ri אֵי, "where?" ("where is strong drink for princes?" comp. Gen. iv. 9). [BÖTT. regards it as a probable Simeonite synonym for תַּאֲוָה, "desire," § 436, 3; 453, *g*. The two forms of the king's name, לְמוּאֵל and לְמוֹאֵל, a genitive in ver. 1 and a vocative in ver. 4, also deserve attention. The changing person of the verbs is no uncommon phenomenon. See EWALD, § 309, *a*.—A.]

Ver. 5.—מְחֻקָּק, a Pual part. from חקק, signifies "that which is decided, the prescribed," and is therefore equivalent to חֹק, "law."

Ver. 6.—[תְּנוּ the *permissive* use of the Imper.; BÖTT., § 959, 5.—A.]

Ver. 12.—גָּמַל is used with two accusatives as in 1 Sam. xxiv. 18.

Ver. 13.—[The fem. noun פִּשְׁתָּה seems to be used of the raw material, *flax*, while this plural from פֵּשֶׁת is used of the product, the materials for clothing.—A.]

Ver. 15.—טֶרֶף (comp. the verb הַטְרִיפֵנִי in xxx. 8) is a strong expression for לֶחֶם, ver. 14 (comp. above in ver. 11, שָׁלָל, "spoil").

Ver. 16.—The K'thibh נְטַע, *stat. constr.* from נֶטַע, "planting," Is. v. 7, is undoubtedly to be preferred to the K'ri נָטְעָה, notwithstanding all the old versions prefer the latter (see BERTHEAU and HITZIG on the passage). [BÖTT. defends the Masoretic reading, and renders as a verb.]

Ver. 21.—[The short form of the part. לָבֻשׁ seems to be explained and justified by the close connection of words and the sequence of שׁ. BÖTT., § 994, 6.—A.]

Ver. 27.—Instead of the K'thibh הֵילְכוֹת we must either with the K'ri read הֲלִיכוֹת, or regard the former as an Aramaic collateral form (הִלְכָּה) for הֲלָכוֹת.

Ver. 30.—יִרְאַת before יְהוָה is here the *stat. constr.* not of the abstract substantive יִרְאָה, but from the fem. part. יְרֵאָה, "the woman who feareth."

EXEGETICAL.

1. Ver. 1. *The superscription to Lemuel's discourse.*—**Words of Lemuel, king of Massa.**—That we must, in disregard of the Masoretic pointing, connect the "Massa" with the first clause, and regard it as a genitive governed by the מֶלֶךְ, which has no article, was the right view taken as early as the Syriac version, when it interprets the מֶלֶךְ מַשָּׂא by "king of utterance" (*regis prophetæ*). We ought, however, here, as in chap. xxx. 1, to regard מַשָּׂא rather as the name of a country, and Lemuel, the king of the land, as perhaps a brother of Agur, and consider his mother as the same wise princess who was there designated as "ruler of Massa." To her therefore belong properly and originally the counsels and instructions for kings contained in vers. 1–9. And yet, since Lemuel first reduced them to writing, and so transmitted them to posterity, they may well be called also "words of Lemuel,"—a title which there is therefore no need of altering (with HITZIG) to "words to Lemuel." The name "Lemuel," or, as it is written in ver. 4 by the punctuators, "Lemoel," appears furthermore to be quite as properly a genuine Hebrew formation as "Agur" (see above, Exeg. notes on chap. xxx., No. 2). It is probably only a fuller form for that which occurs in Numb. iii. 24 as an Israelitish masculine name, לָאֵל, "to God, for God" (*Deo deditus*). That it is purely a symbolical appellative designation, a circumscribing of the name Solomon, and that accordingly by the "mother of Lemuel" no other than Bathsheba is intended, this opinion of many old expositors (and recently of SCHELLING, ROSENMUELLER [WORDS.], *etc.*) lacks all further corroboration. [The impossibility of regarding מֶלֶךְ without an article as an appositive of לְמוּאֵל, even though מַשָּׂא be not a limiting genitive, but an appositive to דִּבְרֵי, is not admitted by those who defend the prevailing interpretation of ver. 1. The construction is admitted to be exceptional, but claimed to be possible (see, *e. g.*, GREEN, § 247, *a*). HITZIG, BERTHEAU, Z. and others make this one chief reason for seeking a new rendering. Another is the peculiar use of מַשָּׂא out of prophecy, and as an appositive to the sufficient and more appropriate דִּבְרֵי. Here as in xxx. 1 KAMPH. retains the ordinary meaning of מַשָּׂא, while S., here as there, follows HITZIG.—A.] In regard to the peculiar linguistic character of the section vers. 1–9, which in many points agrees with Agur's discourse [and in which BÖTTCHER again recognizes a Simeonitish cast], see above, p. 246.

2. Vers. 2–9. *The rules of wisdom from Lemuel's mother.*—**Oh my son! Oh thou son of my womb!** *etc.*—The thrice repeated מָה, usually "what"—which LUTHER appropriately rendered by "Ach!" is plainly "an impassioned exclamation expressing the inward emotion of the mother's heart at the thought that the son might possibly

Digitized by Google

fall into an evil way" (ELSTER); it is therefore substantially "What, my son, wilt thou do?" or "How, my son, wilt thou suffer thyself to be betrayed?" *etc.*—With "son of my vows" comp. 1 Sam. i. 11.

Ver. 3. **Give not thy strength to women**—*i. e.*, do not sacrifice it to them, do not give thy manly strength and vigor a prey to them. It is naturally the ways of licentiousness that are intended, which ruin physically and morally kings and princes who give themselves up to them. See Critical notes.

Vers. 4. This warning against licentiousness is immediately followed by a dissuasion from drunkenness, which is naturally closely connected with the preceding.—**Also not for princes** (is wine) **or strong drink.**—See Critical notes. For שֵׁכָר, "mead, strong drink," comp. notes on xx. 1.—[GESEN., BÖTT., DE W., H., N., S., M., *etc.*, would render by "desire," if the K'thibh is followed, which they are disposed to do. The K'ri, pointing אֵי, suggests either the interrogative אֵי, "where," or an abbreviated form of the negative אֵין. FUERST renders אוֹ as an interrogative here. —A.]

Ver. 5. **Lest he drink and forget the law**—*i. e.*, the king, who is here in question. The construction ("drink and forget" instead of "drinking forget") is like that in chap. xxx. 9. —**And pervert the judgment of all the sons of want**—*i. e.*, of all the poor and helpless. For the Piel שִׁנָּה, "*in deterius mutare*, to distort, wrest, destroy," comp. Job xiv. 20. For the sentiment comp. PLINY, *Hist. Nat.*, XXIII. 25: *In proverbiam cessit sapientiam vino obumbrari.* [It has become proverbial that wisdom is clouded by wine.]

Vers. 6, 7. The enjoyment of wine and strong drink is seasonable in its cheering influence upon the sorrowful, whom it is desirable to cause to forget their sorrow; comp. Ps. civ. 15; Matth. xxvii. 34.—**Give strong drink to him who is perishing**—the man who is on the point of perishing, who is just expiring, as Job xxix. 13; xxxi. 19: "the heavy in heart" are afflicted, anxious ones, as in Job iii. 20; 1 Sam. xxii. 2, *etc.* [That even these be made to drink to unconsciousness is not the recommendation, but that in their extremity, physical or mental, wine be given to fulfil its office in imparting elasticity, and increasing power of endurance, and taking the crushing weight from calamities that might otherwise be overwhelming. As there is a misuse pointed out before in drinking to the destruction of kingly competence and the thwarting of kingly duty, self-indulgence, sinful excitement and excess overmastering reason and conscience,—so it is a kingly grace to bear others' burdens by ministries of helpful kindness. As on the one hand there is nothing here to preclude the pressing of other pleas for abstinence, so on the other there is nothing to encourage the too early and willing resort to the plea of necessity, or to commend in any case drinking to utter oblivion.—A.]

Vers. 8, 9. Continuation of the exhortation, commenced in ver. 5, to a righteous and merciful administration.—**Open thy mouth for the dumb.**—That is, help such to their right as are not able to maintain it for themselves; be to them a judge and at the same time an advocate (comp. Job xxix. 15, 16).—**For the right of all orphan children.**—"Sons of leaving, of abandonment or disadvantage" (not of "destruction," as EWALD and BERTHEAU would interpret here, with a reference to Ps. xc. 5; Is. ii. 18), are clearly those left behind as helpless orphans; the word therefore conveys a more specific idea than the "sons of want" in ver. 5.

3. *The praise of the virtuous matron* (vers. 10-31) is an alphabetic moral poem (like Ps. ix., x., xxv., xxxiv., cxix.; Lam. i.—iv., *etc.*), "a golden A B C for women" according to DÖDERLEIN's pertinent designation, a highly poetic picture of the ideal of a Hebrew matron. Not the alphabetic structure indeed, which it has in common with not a few Psalms of high antiquity, partly such as come from David (comp. DELITZSCH, Psalms I. 69; II. 187), but very probably some traces that are contained in it of a later *usus loquendi*, especially the more frequent *scriptio plena*, even apart from the distinctive accents (comp. HITZIG, p. 334), and also in particular the position assigned it by the compiler, even after Hezekiah's supplement and Agur's and Lemuel's discourse, mark the poem as a literary work produced quite late after Solomon's time, and even as probably the latest constituent of the whole collection. Although separated from the "words of Lemuel" by no superscription of its own, it shows itself to be the work of a different person from the wise prince of Massa, and that probably a later poet, by its not sharing the linguistic idioms of that section, and by the whole of its characteristic bearing and structure. Besides, in its contents and general drift it does not stand in any particularly close and necessary connection with the maxims of wisdom from the mother of Lemuel. And that it has by no means steadily from the beginning held its place immediately after these, appears with great probability from the fact that the LXX attach it directly to xxix. 27, and give to the proverbs of Agur and Lemuel an earlier place (within the limits of the present 24th chapter). Comp. Introd., § 13, p. 30.

With the greatest arbitrariness, R. STIER (*Politik der Weisheit*, pp. 134 sq.) has felt constrained to interpret the matron of this poem allegorically, and to make the application to the Holy Spirit renewing men and educating them for the kingdom of God. The whole attitude of the section speaks against such an interpretation, most of all the praise bestowed in vers. 23 sq. upon the influence of the matron as advancing the standing of her husband in the political organization of the State, as well as what is said in ver. 30 of the fear of God as her most eminent virtue. Comp. VON HOFMANN, *Schriftbew.*, II., 2, 378. [According to WORDSW. we find here a prophetic representation *of the Church of Christ*, in her truth, purity and holiness, and as distinguished from all forms of error, corruption and defilement, which sully and mar the faith and worship which he has prescribed."—A.]

4. Vers. 10-22. The action and management of the virtuous woman *within her domestic sphere.* **A virtuous woman, who can find?** The "virtuous woman," as in xii. 4; chap. xi. 16. [The transition is easy, from physical strength to moral strength and probity. The word "vir-

Digitized by Google

tuous" is therefore to be taken in this high sense.—A.]. The interrogative exclamation "who will find?" express the idea of a wish, as מִי יִתֵּן does elsewhere; it is therefore equivalent to "would that every one might find so gracious a treasure!"—**And yet her price is far above pearls.** The "and" at the beginning of this clause is either the exegetical, "that is, that is to say," as in xxv. 13, *etc.* (thus HITZIG), or, which seems to be more natural, the adversative "and yet, however" (EWALD, ELSTER). For the figure comp. iii. 10; viii. 11. [THOMSON, *Land and Book*, II. 572 sq. illustrates the force and fitness of the successive points in this description in contrast with the ordinary ignorance, weakness and worthlessness of the women of the East.—A.]

Ver. 11. **And he shall not fail of gain.** שָׁלָל, strictly "the spoil of war," is a strong expression to describe the rich profit to which the co-operation of the efficient wife helps her husband's activity in his occupation. According to HITZIG, "spoil, fortunate discovery," is to be taken here as in Ps. cxix. 162; Isa. ix. 2, figuratively, and to be interpreted of the joy which the wife prepares for her husband (?).

Ver. 12. **She doeth him good and not evil.** Comp. 1 Sam. xxiv. 12.

Ver. 13. **She careth for wool and linen;** lit., "she *seeketh* (busieth herself with) wool and linen," *i. e.*, she provides these as materials for the products of her feminine skill.—**And worketh with diligent hands;** lit., "and laboreth with her hands' pleasure" (UMBREIT, EWALD, ELSTER) [DE W., K., E. V., N., S., M.], or inasmuch as חֵפֶץ might here signify "occupation" (as in Is. lviii. 3; Eccles. iii. 17); "and laboreth in the business of her hands" (HITZIG).

Ver. 14. **She is like the ships of the merchant,** so far forth as she selling her products to foreigners (ver. 24), brings in gain from remote regions (comp. *b*), and provides long in advance for all the necessities of her house.

Ver. 15. **And distributeth food to her house.** The "portion" of the next clause is not a possible synonym for the "food" of this, so that it should denote the definite allowance of food, the rations of the maidens (LUTHER, BERTHEAU [E. V., S., M.] *etc.*); what is described by it is the definite *pensum*, what each maid has to spin of wool, flax, *etc.*, and therefore the day's work of the maidens (EWALD, UMBREIT, HITZIG [DE W., K., H., N.] *etc.*).

Ver. 16. **She considereth a field and buyeth it,** that is, for the money earned by her diligent manual labor.—**A vineyard** (Z. "a vineyard-planting") **with the fruit of her hands.** A "planting of a vineyard" (*genit. apposit.*) is however the same as a planting of vines. See Critical Notes for another construction and rendering.

Ver. 17. Comp. ver. 25 *a*.

Ver. 18. **She perceiveth that her gain is good.** For this verb טָעַם "to taste," *i. e.*, to discern, to become aware, comp. Ps. xxxiv. 9. For the succeeding phrase, "excellent, charming is her gain," comp. iii. 14. What she now does in consequence of this perception of the pleasing nature of her gain, is shown in the 2d clause.

Ver. 19. **She putteth her hands to the distaff.** This is the usual rendering. But probably HITZIG's rendering is more exact (following VATABL., MERCERUS, GESEN., *etc.*): "Her hands she throweth out with the whorl," for כִּישׁוֹר is not properly the "distaff," but the 'whorl, or wheel,' *verticulum*, "a ring or knob fastened upon the spindle below the middle, that it may fall upon its base, and may revolve rightly." [KAMPH. rejects this explanation, and gives an extract of some length from a "Book of Inventions, Trades and Industries," to justify his own, which is the old view. The word translated "fingers" is literally her "bent hands."—A.]

Ver. 20. **Her hand she stretcheth forth to the poor,** lit., "her hollow, or bent hand," in which she holds her gift.

Ver. 21. **She is not afraid of the snow for her household,** lit., "feareth not for her house from snow." The snow stands here for "winter's cold," and for this reason,—that the sharpest possible contrast is intended with the clothes of "crimson wool," woolen stuffs of crimson color with which her household go clothed in winter. The same alliterative antithesis of שָׁנִים and שֶׁלֶג is found in Is. i. 18.—UMBREIT, EWALD, BERTHEAU, S., *etc.*, render שָׁנִים incorrectly by "purple garments" (see in objection to this BAEHR's *Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus*, I. 333 sq.), while the LXX, LUTHER, ROSENM., VAIHINGER, H., *etc.*, read שְׁנַיִם (*vestimenta duplicia*, "double clothing"), by which the strong contrast is sacrificed.

Ver. 22. **Coverlets doth she prepare for herself.** For the "coverlets" comp. vii. 16. An article of clothing can be intended no more here than there. In the costly articles of apparel which the woman wears, the contrasted colors, white and purple, recur again. The *byssus* (COPT. *schensch*) and the "purple" (reddish purple in contrast with the (violet) "bluish purple" תְּכֵלֶת) are both foreign materials, the one an Egyptian, the other a Syro-phœnician production.—Comp. BAEHR, *ubi supra;* WINER in his *Realwörterb.* Articles *Baumwolle* and *Purpur*.

5. Vers. 23—31. The influence of the matron beyond the narrow sphere of the domestic life. —**Her husband is well known in the gates,** because the excellence of his wife not only makes him rich but important and famous. With this being "known in the gates," see also ver. 31 *b* (*i. e.*, well known in counsel), comp. HOMER's: ἐναρίθμιος ἐνὶ βουλῇ, Iliad ii. 202.

Ver. 24. **She maketh fine linen,** *etc.* סָדִין=σινδών (comp. LXX here and in Judg. xiv. 12) fine linen and shirts made of it (comp. Mark xiv. 51; Is. iii. 23, and HITZIG on this passage). —**And girdles doth she give to the merchant,** lit. to "the Canaanite," the Phœnician merchant, who knows well how to prize her fine products, and to dispose of them.

Ver. 25. With *a* comp. ver. 17; Job. xxiv. 14.—**She laugheth at the future.** In reliance on

Digitized by Google

her ample stores, and still more her inward strength and skill, she laughs at the future as respects the evil that it may perchance bring. [E. V.: "She shall rejoice in time to come;" H., M., W.; while De W., K., Bertheau, Muffet, N., S., *etc.*, take our author's view. This "laughing at the future" is of course not to be understood as expressive of a presumptuous self-confidence, but only of a consciousness of having all appropriate and possible preparation and competence for the future.—A.]

Ver. 26. **Her mouth she openeth with wisdom.** Hitzig well says: "The mouth, which in 25 *a*, is smiling, is here a speaker."—The "law of kindness" in *b* is not "amiable, loving instruction, but that which is pleasing, gracious;" comp. Is. xl. 6; and especially Luke iv. 22 (λόγοι τῆς χάριτος).

Ver. 27. **She looketh well to the ways of her household;** lit. "she who looketh," *etc.*—for the partic. צוֹפִיָּה is probably to be connected, as Hitzig takes it, as grammatically an appositive to the subject of the preceding verse, so that according to this view, it is now the object of her pleasing instruction that is given. The "ways of the house" are naturally its organization and management, the *course* of the household economy (comp. Luther: "How it goes in her house").

Vers. 28, 29 describe the praise which the excellent housekeeper has bestowed upon her by her sons and her husband. The words of the latter are expressly quoted, but they are probably not to be extended through the last three verses (as Umbreit, Ewald, Elster, *etc.*, would do), but to be restricted to ver. 29; for verse 30 immediately separates itself as a proposition altogether general, by which the poet comes in with his confirmation of the husband's praise. [So De W., Bertheau, K., N., S., M.].—**Many daughters have done virtuously.** The husband says "daughters" and not "women," because as an elder he may put himself above his wife (comp. Heb. vii. 7). With the phrase "have done virtuously, or show themselves virtuous," lit. "make, produce, manifest virtue," comp. Num. xxiv. 18; Ruth iv. 11.

Ver. 30. **Grace is a deception, beauty a breath;** both are no real abiding attributes of man, and are, therefore, not to be praised. As an imperishable and therefore really praiseworthy possession, there is contrasted with them in *b* the disposition to fear God. Comp. Is. xl. 6; Ps. ciii. 15—18; 1 Pet. i. 24, 25. [Observe how our book just at its close dwells in a very different way, yet with a significant emphasis, upon that "fear of the Lord," which in i. 7 was pronounced "the beginning of wisdom." —A.]

Ver. 31. **Give her of the fruit of her hands,** *i. e.*, of the praise which she has deserved by the labor of her hands.—**And let her work praise her in the gates** [not with Z., "let them praise her work in the gates," for the verb has its object in its suffix.—A.]. In the place where the population of the city gathers in largest numbers, in the assembly of the community at the gate (ver. 23), there must the praise of her excellent life and work resound.

DOCTRINAL, ETHICAL, HOMILETIC AND PRACTICAL.

The central idea to which we may trace back the two divisions of this concluding chapter, quite unequal, it is true, in their size, is this: *Of a pious administration, as the king should maintain it in the State, and the woman in her family.* For the fear of God quite as really constitutes the foundation of the virtues of chastity, sobriety, righteousness and compassion, to which Lemuel's mother counsels this son of her's (vers. 2-9), as it, according to ver. 30, forms the deepest basis and the glorious crown of the excellences for which the virtuous matron is praised (vers. 10 sq). It has already been brought out prominently in the exegetical comments, that the delineation which is shaped in praise of the latter, in turn falls into two divisions (which are only relatively different),—the first of which treats of the efficiency of the virtuous woman within the circle of her domestic relations, the second of her activity as extending itself beyond this sphere into wider regions.

Homily on the chapter as a whole:—Of the pious administration of the king in his State and the woman in her household; what both should shun and what they should strive for, with an exhibition of the blessed reward that awaits both. Or, more briefly: A mirror for rulers and a mirror for matrons, with the fear of God as the centre and focus of both.—Stöcker: I. Instruction of Solomon the king by his mother. *a*) To be shunned: lust and drunkenness. *b*) To be practised: justice. II. Praise of a virtuous woman. 1) Her duties or general virtues; 2) her ornaments or special virtues (ver. 25-27); 3) her reward (vers. 28-31).

Vers. 1-9. *Tübingen Bible* (on ver. 1): How good is the report when parents, especially mothers, teach their children good morals. It is the greatest love that they can show them, but also their foremost duty!—Geier (on ver. 2): If parents have dedicated their children from birth to the Lord, they must so much more carefully educate them from youth up, and so much more diligently pray for them.—(On ver. 3): Let every husband be content with the wife conferred upon him by God, let him live with her chastely and discreetly, and serve God heartily; that is a truly noble, kingly life.—Starke (on vers. 6, 7): A draught of wine which is bestowed on a suffering member of Christ's body on his sick or dying bed is better appropriated than whole casks that are misemployed for indulgence. —Von Gerlach (on vers. 8, 9): The highest duty of kings is to befriend the helpless.

Vers. 10 sq. Luther: There is nothing dearer on earth than woman's love to him who can gain it. Comp. also P. Gerhard's poetical treatment of the passage, "*Voller Wunder, voller Kunst, etc.* (*Gesamm. geistl. Lieder,*" No. 107).—Melanchthon: As virtues of the true matron there are named, above all the fear of God as the sum of all duties to God; then chastity, fidelity, love to her husband without any murmuring; diligence and energy in all domestic avocations; frugality, moderation and gentleness in the treatment of servants; care in the training of children, and

Digitized by Google

beneficence to the poor.—ZELTNER (on vers. 11 sq.): God gives to pious married people their subsistence and their needed bit of bread, yea, He blesses them, yet not without prayer and work.—[ARNOT: Empty hours, empty hands, empty companions, empty words, empty hearts, draw in evil spirits, as a vacuum draws in air. To be occupied with good is the best defence against the inroads of evil].—GEIER (on ver. 23): A pious virtuous wife is her husband's ornament and honor (1 Cor. xi. 7). A vicious one, however, is a stain in every way (Ecclesiast. xxv. 22 sq.).—[ARNOT (on ver. 25): If honor be your clothing, the suit will last a lifetime; but if clothing be your honor, it will soon be worn threadbare].

Vers. 30, 31. LUTHER (marginal, on ver. 30): A woman can dwell with a man honorably and piously and be mistress of his house with a good conscience, but must to this end and with this fear God, trust and pray.—CRAMER: The fear of God is the most beautiful of all ornaments of woman's person; 1 Pet. iii. 4.—ZELTNER: If thou hast outward beauty see to it that thy heart and soul also be beautified before God in faith.—[TRAPP: The body of honor is virtue, the soul of it humility.—ARNOT: True devotion is chiefly in secret; but the bulk of a believer's life is laid out in common duties, and cannot be hid. Lift up your heart to God and lay out your talents for the world; lay out your talents for the world and lift up your heart to God].—STARKE (on ver. 31): Works of piety and love preserve among men a good remembrance, and are also rewarded by God of His grace in everlasting joy; Heb. vi. 10; Ps. lxi. 6. My God, let my works also graciously please Thee in Christ Jesus.

AMEN.

Digitized by Google

ECCLESIASTES;

OR,

KOHELETH.

BY

DR. OTTO ZÖCKLER,

PROF. OF THEOLOGY, GREIFSWALD.

AMERICAN EDITION.

EDITED, WITH ANNOTATIONS, DISSERTATIONS ON LEADING IDEAS,

TOGETHER WITH

A NEW METRICAL VERSION AND AN INTRODUCTION THERETO,

BY

PROF. TAYLER LEWIS, LL.D.

OF SCHENECTADY, N. Y.

TRANSLATED BY

WILLIAM WELLS, A. M.

PROFESSOR OF THE GERMAN LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE, UNION COLLEGE, N. Y.

NEW YORK:
CHARLES SCRIBNER & CO., 654 BROADWAY.
1870.

Digitized by Google

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1870, by
CHARLES SCRIBNER,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Stereotyped by
JAS. B. RODGERS CO.,
PHILADELPHIA.

Digitized by Google

ECCLESIASTES.

SOLOMON, THE PREACHER.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. NAME AND CHARACTER OF THE BOOK.

According to the title: "The words of Koheleth, Son of David, King of Jerusalem," this book contains the discourses or reflections of a king whom the author presents as Solomon, but whom he designates with the peculiarly symbolical appellative קֹהֶלֶת. This expression, which is not used outside of this book, is used again in it several times, and twice with the article (vii. 27; xii. 8; comp. i. 2, 12; xii. 9, 10). It is clearly allied with קָהָל assembly, congregation of the people, and, as there is no such verb in Kal, is to be connected with Hiphil, הִקְהִיל (Numb. viii. 9; x. 7; xx. 8; Job xi. 10), and is accordingly to be considered as the feminine participial form with the signification of one holding an assembly, preaching. This signification which the oldest translators and expositors express (Sept.: ἐκκλησιαστής; HIERONYMUS: *concionator;* hence LUTHER: "Preacher") appears to stand in direct relation to the Chokmah of the Old Covenant, the personified Wisdom, preaching in the streets and on the market places, gathering around it all who were eager to learn (Prov. i. 20 sqq.; viii. 1 sqq.; ix. 1 sqq.). From an original designation of this wisdom, the name Koheleth seems to have become the surname of Solomon, the teacher of wisdom κατ' ἐξοχήν, or, as it were, wisdom incarnate,—a surname that with special propriety could be conferred on the great King, when he was represented as teaching and preaching, as in the apocryphal book of wisdom (chap. vii. 1 sq.; ix. 7, 8, *etc.*), or as in ours. If one does not wish thus to explain the feminine form, Koheleth, as a designation of a male individual (with EWALD, KÖSTER, HENGSTENBERG, HITZIG, and others), there is nothing left but to accept an *abstractum pro concreto*, or, what is the same thing, to derive the feminine ending from the character of the name as an official name; for which analogies may be quoted in the Syriac and Arabic, as in the later Hebrew (*e. g.*, פֶּחָה, מֶלֶךְ=מַלְכוּת administrator, כְּנָת fellow-citizen, *etc.;* comp. J. D. MICHAELIS, Supplement to *Heb. Lex.*, p. 2168; GESENIUS, *Lehrgebäude*, p. 468, and KNOBEL *Commentary*, 10.)—In any case, Solomon, who was pre-eminently and emphatically the wise man among the kings of Israel, must be understood under the peculiar name of Koheleth; as is shown not only by the title, but also by the studied description of the learning of Koheleth, comprehending every thing under heaven (i. 13; viii. 9), and by his zealous searching after wisdom and truth (i. 13; xii. 9), his transcendent fame as a sage (i. 16; ii. 15), and finally his activity as a teacher of wisdom and author of proverbs (xii. 9). For these are all characteristics which the book of Kings attribute honorably to Solomon, and of all the posterity of David, to him only (1 Kings ii. 9; iii. 12; v. 9-13; x. 1; see the Introduction to the Literature of Solomon in general (in the beginning of this volume).

The whole literary character of the book proves also that it belongs to the circle of the Solo-

Digitized by Google

monic writings on wisdom, if not in the narrower then in the broader sense, and raises it to a certainty, that under the Koheleth, therein appearing as speaker, none other can be meant than Solomon. For the book belongs clearly to the class of didactic teachings, and is distinguished from the Proverbs as the characteristic and principal representative of this poetic style in the Old Testament, mainly by the fact that it does not range numerous individual proverbs loosely and without consecutive plan, but rather develops one narrow and close circle of thoughts and truths in poetical and rhetorical form. The idea of the *vanity of all human things* clearly forms the centre of this circle of thought, the common theme of the four discourses, into which the whole falls according to the division mainly corresponding to the intention and plan of the author. To the dialectically progressive development and illumination in various directions which these discourses cast upon the theme in question, there corresponds an appropriate change from special moral maxims to longer or shorter descriptions of conditions, citations of doctrines or examples, observations regarding personal experience, and reflections on prominent and subordinate truths. There is also, in a formal view, a strophic division of the discourse, marked by formulas and terms repeated either literally or in sense, and a fitting diversity of style corresponding to the various objects, expressed in rhythmical prose, or lofty rhetorical and poetical diction. As the shortest expression for the designation of these peculiarities, the term "*Philosophical and Didactic Poem*" might be used; but in this, however, the idea of the philosophical must embrace the characteristic peculiarities of the spiritual life and aspirations of the Hebrews, or rather of the Shemitic people in general (comp. *Introd. to Proverbs*, § 2, p. 5 sqq.).

OBSERVATION 1.—The tracing of the name קהלת to קהל, הקהיל in the sense of *congregare, conscionari*, has the best authority, and is supported by the oldest as well as by the most numerous and critical among the modern expositors of this book. HIERONYMUS says, *Comment. in Eccles.* i. 1: "Coëleth, *i. e.*, Ecclesiastes. 'Εκκλησιαστής *autem Græco sermone appellatur, qui coetum, i. e., ecclesiam congregat, quem nos nuncupare possumus concionatorem, eo quod loquatur ad populum, et sermo ejus non specialiter ad unum, sed ad universos generaliter dirigatur.*" Later expositors and lexicographers have fixed the fundamental meaning of the root קהל properly as that of "calling," and hence compare קול Arabic *qûla*, and Greek καλέω., with Latin, *calare, clamare.* קֹהֶלֶת "the caller, the preacher," is clearly nearest allied to the synonymous הַקּוֹרֵא Isaiah xl. 3. On account of this fundamental signification of "calling," we condemn those expositions of the name which proceed from the supposed root idea of gathering or collecting. To these belong 1) the opinion of GROTIUS, HERDER, JAHN, *etc.*: that the word means *collector sententiarum*, a collector of sentences—a view that some ancient translators have already expressed, *e. g.*, AQUILA (συναθροιστής); SYMMACHUS (παροιμιαστής); 2) VAN DER PALM'S modification of this view from a partial consideration of 1 Kings viii. 1; in which Solomon is spoken of as the assembler of his people and his elders קֹהֶלֶת *i. e., congregator, coactor;* 3) the view of NACHTIGAL and DÖDERLEIN, that קֹהֶלֶת=*congregatio, consessus*, "learned assembly, academy," according to which the book would be marked as a collection of philosophical disputations in the style of the *Seances of Hariri*, or the *Collectiones Patrum* of CASSIAN (an acceptation clearly at variance with such passages as i. 12; xii. 9, 10, *etc.*); 4) the strange assertion of KAISER: that קֹהֶלֶת is the same as *collectivum*, and means the whole of the Davidic Kings, from Solomon to Zedekiah, whose history the book delineates in chronological order (KAISER, *Koheleth*, the *Collectivum* of the Davidic Kings, Erlangen, 1823, comp. § 6).—That no one of these explanations deserves attention, in view of the illustrations already given, is quite as certain as that it must also remain doubtful which of the two efforts to explain the feminal form of the name, which our paragraph has named as the principal, or, rather, only possible ones, deserves the preference. For the view of the expression taken by EWALD and KÖSTER, that it is synonymous with wisdom, and in so far a fitting designation of Solomon, the embodied wisdom, various significant parallels besides those above quoted press themselves on our attention; *e. g.*,

Digitized by Google

in an extra-biblical field the surname given to the sophist Protagoras, *Σοφία*, and, what is more important, the self-designation of Christ, the New Testament Solomon, as the *Σοφία* or *Σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ* (Matth. ii. 19; Luke xi. 49), with which, according to BENGEL's example, may be directly combined the declaration concerning the desire of gathering the children of Jerusalem under his wings (Matth. xxiii. 37; Luke xiii. 34).* The view first advanced by MICHAELIS, and then adopted by GESENIUS, KNOBEL, ELSTER, VAIHINGER, HAHN, KEIL, and others, now again appears, namely, that the feminine ending is explained by the character of the name as an official name, besides the already quoted names, פֶּחָה, מַלְכוּת, כְּנָת, and still more are we aided by the analogies of expression such as סֹפֶרֶת "the writer," Ezra ii. 55; Neh. vii. 57; and פֹּכֶרֶת "the catcher, hunter" (contained in the proper name פֹּכֶרֶת הַצְּבָיִים *i. e.*, gazelle-hunter, Ezra ii. 57; Neh. vii. 59); for these names are closely allied with קֹהֶלֶת.† And, moreover, since the Koheleth of our book appears every where as a real person, and no where clearly as a personified idea, and since expressions such as those contained in i. 16 f.; ii. 12, *etc.;* according to which the speaker attributes to himself an effort, a seeking, an obtaining, would not be especially appropriate in the mouth of personified wisdom, the weightiest arguments seem to declare in favor of the second mode of explanation, but without the absolute exclusion of the other.—But in any case we must adopt for the explanation of the feminine form one or the other of the above quoted hypotheses, and not the opinion of MERCERUS, that by the feminine ending there is an intimation of the senile weakness of the preacher, and consequently of the advanced age at which Solomon wrote the book; nor the view of ZIRKEL (see § 6), that the feminine ending is chosen because of the delicate and graceful style of the book, nor the still more fanciful assertion of AUGUSTI (Introd. to the O. T., § 172), that Koheleth is the spirit of Solomon returned to the realm of the living, and now represented as the preacher of wisdom, and that its feminine designation is to be understood in the neutral sense, because those deceased and living after death were considered destitute of gender, in harmony with Matth. xxii. 30. It has been justly made to appear in opposition to this latter view, by KNOBEL, ELSTER and others, that the book itself no where hints at the character of the speaker, as of a spirit from Scheol, and that apparitions in the Old Testament, as 1 Sam. xxviii. 11 ff. proves, clearly appear as something rare and abnormal, and that on account of the well known prohibition of conjuration of the dead (Lev. xix. 31; xx. 6; Deut. xviii. 11; Isa. viii. 19) even the poetic fiction of an apparition of Solomon could hardly occur, especially in religious writings laying claim to canonicity.

OBSERVATION 2.

The character of this book has suffered manifold misapprehensions, as well in a theological point of view (for which see below § 5) as in the rhetorical and esthetical. It has been accused of numerous contradictions with itself, of absence of plan and connection, on account of a faulty perception of its inner economy, and the development of its thoughts. It has been declared inconsistent that passages like i. 11; ii. 15, 16; iii. 19, 20; ix. 25, *etc.*, assert the complete equality of the final fate of the godly and the ungodly; whilst others, as iii. 17; viii. 12, 13; xi. 9; xii. 13, 14, promise a corresponding divine reward for each individual moral act, and therefore expressly exhort to uprightness and the fear of God. It has also been found contradictory, that the author sometimes praises wisdom as bringing profit and blessings (ii. 3, 12–14; vii. 10–12; viii. 1–6; x. 2; x. 13–16), and sometimes declares that it is injurious, making men ill-humored, and not leading to the goal of its endeavors; sometimes indeed causing more unhappiness than

* Comp. BENGEL's remarks on Luke x. 49 in the *Gnomon*, N. T., p. 164: ἡ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ, *Sapientia Dei, Suave nomen.* Koheleth, *congregatrix*, chap. xiii. 34 (ποσάκις ἠθέλησα ἐπισυνάξαι κ. τ. λ.). Comp. also STARKE (Pref. to Ecclesiastes, § 2), who also considers Koheleth synonymous with wisdom, following the example of GEIER, SEB. SCHMIDT, RAMBACH, *et al.*; also DINDORF, *Quomodo nomen Koheleth, Solomoni tribuatur*, Lips.; 1791, and GURLITT: "*Studien und Kritiken*" in explanation of the Book of Koheleth, 1865, II., 325 ff.

† [The strongest confirmation of all this is found in the use of the Greek feminine noun ἀρχὴ, for ruler, magistrate, as though it were equivalent to ἄρχων, just as we use the word *authority*, or the *authorities*, for magistrates. See especially Paul's remarkable use of this feminine noun for *authorities*, powers, "*principalities*, in the heavens," Rom. viii. 35; Eph. i. 21; iii. 10; vi. 12; Col. i. 16; ii. 15; Titus iii. 1.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

does folly, (i. 18; viii. 14; ix. 11, 18; x. 1). It is not less contradictory that at one time he praises his own wisdom, and at another maintains that he has not acquired wisdom (Sec. 16; ii. 3, 9, 15, with vii. 23, 24); that now he praises women, and recommends association with them, and now warns us against their seductive and immoral nature. (Comp. ii. 8; ix. 9, with vii. 7, 26–29); at one time recommends repose, at another activity (see iv. 6, with ix. 10); again he praises obedience to authority as being not without profit, and then he complains of the unjust oppression of subjects by their superiors (comp. viii. 5, with iii. 16; v. 7; x. 4 ff.), and finally he declares the dead and the unborn as happier than the living, and soon again calls life sweet, and greatly prefers it to death, (comp. iv. 2, 3, with ix. 4–6; xi. 7).—But aside from the fact that many of these so-called contradictions are but apparent, and become perfectly harmonious in view of the diverse tendency and surroundings of the individual assertions, or indeed through the double signification of one and the same word, as is here and there the case, comp. (*e.g.* כַּעַס vii. 3, with the same word in vii. 9; חֵן in ix. 11, with חֵן in x. 12, *etc.*,) a certain vacillation and unsteady effort in the presentation of the author is a necessary condition of his peculiar theme—*the doctrine of the vanity of all earthly things.* The most contradictory experiences which he may have made in life, he seeks to reproduce in a corresponding and often abrupt change of his feelings, a vivid transition of his thoughts and expressions,—a peculiarity which UMBREIT has not inappropriately characterized by his designation of the entire contents of the book as a "soul struggle, an inner strife between the judgment and the feelings of a wise old King;" (comp. § 6).

In this respect, also, VAIHINGER strikingly observes, ("*Ecclesiastes and the Song of Solomon,*" p. 8, f.): "It must be acknowledged that the preacher is not free from a timid uncertainty, from a doubting vacillation and striving in his mode of reflecting; that he strikingly depicts the want of a perfect clearness regarding human life and divine providence, in the varied experiences of man. The reason of this may be easily discovered by a consideration of the general and special stand-point on which he rests. He was once as Job, a thinking mind, that did not accept the traditional faith untried, that did not stop at the poetry of life, but penetrated into its prose. In this direction he necessarily entered into a contest when he compared the daily experiences of life, in which men are often left to their own impulses, with the promises of the divine word, in which a sure punishment is announced to the sinner. He could not but perceive how evil often has a wonderful and incomprehensible success, whilst the good is not rewarded. At the same time he himself may have variously experienced the buffetings of life, and have passed through highly repulsive trials that unsettled his mental repose, and shook his faith in the eternal wisdom, goodness, and providence of God, and disposed him to be discontented with life and traditional prejudices. In this frame of mind, and with such experiences, his faith contended with the thought and the reality with the poetry of life, until, like Job, he had conquered a new stand-point. And from just this view is this book so instructive, lifting us out of a partial, arbitrary, and thoughtless faith, showing us the struggles of the thinking mind, and yet ever leading us back to the true faith. And this is the real profit of the genuine life of faith. If it is to be freed from the dross of thoughtlessness and self-sufficiency, from an idle clinging to tradition, it must be seemingly lost in the struggle of life to be found again in loftier purity. Divine truths must all be questioned, in order that we may find them again by inward struggles, and new experiences of God in a sanctified form; (Ps. lxii. 12, 13); and in this relation also avails the expression: "He who loses his life, shall find it again." The author presents to us also in this respect, the true life of faith in his conflicts.*

Besides the intention of presenting to the reader an intuitive vision of his inward strifes and contests, many reasons of a more formal and external nature may have exerted an influence on

*[These admirable remarks of VAIHINGER suggest a thought of great value to one who would read the Scriptures with spiritual profit. In such books as Job and Ecclesiastes, the lesson is in the picture, the *dramatic representation*, as we may call it. It is to be found in the *total impression*, and not in any separate texts or precepts. The struggle, the doubt, the erroneous sentiment, often are necessary to this total effect. Its very contradictions, when rightly viewed, furnish the strongest arguments for the truth ultimately brought out. This does not affect the idea of its plenary inspiration. It is all given to us by the ultimate divine Author, all intended for one great purpose, and thus all of it, even its peculiar diction "profiteth for our instruction in righteousness."—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

the vacillating and contradictory recital of the author; *e. g.*, the intentional interweaving of many digressions (see *e. g.* xii. 2–6), and especially the direct introduction of the expressions of contrary thinkers for the purpose of immediate refutation. Thus appears in Chap. iv. 5, an apparently antagonistic assertion, which in the sixth verse is disapproved and rejected; the same relation is held by x. 16–19, and x. 20. In any case it is perfectly proper and just to consider what HITZIG says, (*Preliminary Observations*, No. 5, p. 125): "It would seem that much that the author says possesses but a momentary influence as a link in the chain of deductions." It performs its duty and is neutralized; the latter assertion abolishes the former; and *at the close* KOHELETH *teaches only that which finally remains uncontradicted.* Comp. below exegetical explanations to chap. ii. 1 ff., No. 1.

OBSERVATION 3.

It cannot much surprise us now, after the above demonstrations, that the plan and thread of thought in the book have been very variously comprehended, and that the schemes adopted for the subdivision of its contents have deviated strongly from one another; and indeed to speak with VILMAR (ART. KOHELETH, *Pastoral Theological Journal*, vol. v. p. 253), "the economy of the book bears almost exactly as many forms as it has found expositors." Of these views and treatises the principal ones will be summarily recounted in Observation 1 of the following paragraph: The poetical form of the book will also receive more critical attention in the following paragraphs, on account of the close connection of its strophical design with its subdivision and the logical progress of its thoughts.

§ 2. CONTENTS AND PLAN.

"All is vanity," a sentence that appears no less than twenty-five times, forms the fundamental thought of the book; an assertion of the vanity of all human relations, destinies, and efforts, based upon experience. As there is in the objective phenomena of this world, *i. e.*, in nature and history, no true progress, but ever a constant return of old things that long have been, a perpetual monotony, a continual circle of things (i. 4–7, 9, 10; iii. 15); thus man, with all his efforts, attains to nothing new, but rather shows himself, in everything that he wishes to investigate, fathom and acquire, most manifoldly limited and controlled by the all-pervading and all-powerful hand of God; (iii. 1-8, 11, 13; viii. 6, 17; ix. 1, 5, 11, 12, *etc.*). On the way of his own efforts and strivings, man is able to arrive at no true and lasting happiness; for neither sensual pleasures (ii. 2, 11; vii. 6, *etc.*) nor earthly possessions and treasures (iii. 9-16; vi. 1-7, *etc.*), nor wisdom (i. 13-18; ii. 14-18; ix. 1, 11; x. 6, *etc.*), not even virtue and the fear of God (iii. 16-18; iv. 1; vii. 15-17; viii. 10, 14); help here below to lasting happiness. But we are not the less to doubt of the presence of a personal God, and of a moral system of the world regulated and watched over by him, (iii. 11, 13, 17; v. 5, 7, 17-19; vi. 2; vii. 13, 14; xi. 5, 9; xii. 7, 14), and the belief of this activity of God governing and directing the world, lends to all sensual and moral blessings of life their only worth (xi. 9; xii. 13, 14). On the basis of this belief it behooves us to enjoy the pleasures of this life in a cheerful, thankful, and contented manner (ii. 24; iii. 12, 13; v. 17, 18; viii. 15; ix. 7–9; xi. 8–11), but we must combine this cheerful enjoyment of life with an earnest endeavor after wisdom as a truly lofty and valuable treasure (vii. 11, 12; ix. 13–16; viii. 1–6, *etc.*), and above all this strive after the fear of God as the source of the highest happiness and peace, and the mother of all virtues (v. 6; vii. 18; viii. 12, 13; xii. 1, 13). In short, the author regards as end and aim of human life on earth, a joy in the blessings and enjoyments of this world, consecrated by wisdom and the fear of God, with renunciation of a perfect reconciliation of existing contrasts, difficulties, and imperfections, and an eye steadily fixed on the future and universal judgment, as the final solution of all the mysteries of the universe.

These contents of the book, as was remarked in § 1, are divided into four discourses of about equal length:

1. DISCOURSE: Chap. 1 and 2.—The *theoretical* wisdom of men, directed to the knowledge of the things of this world, is vanity (i. 2–18), as well as the *practical*, aiming at sensual enjoyments, great worldly enterprises, creations, and performances, (ii. 1-19); neither of these leads to lasting happiness, or to any good that may be considered as the actual fruit of human labor

Digitized by Google

(as the actual יִתְרוֹן of man), and not rather an unconditional gift of Divine Providence, (ii. 20-26).

II. Discourse: Chap. 3-5.—In view of the complete dependence of human action and effort on an immutable and higher system of law (iii. 1-11) the answer to the inquiry after earthly happiness (or יִתְרוֹן) must be that there is no higher good for man than to enjoy this life and to do good, (iii. 12-22); a good that is not easily attained in the diversely changing circumstances of fortune, and the frequently unfavorable situations in private, social, and civil life (iv. 1-16), but a blessing, nevertheless, after which we must strive by piety, conscientiously honest actions, and a spirit sober, contented, and confiding in God, (iv. 17; v. 19).

III. Discourse: Chap. vi. 1-8, 15. Since worldly goods and treasures in themselves cannot lead to true happiness, but are rather vain and transitory, (vi. 1-12), we must strive after the true practical wisdom of life, which consists of patience, contempt of the world, and fear of God (vii. 1-22); and we must seek to gain and realize it, in spite of all the allurements, oppressions, injustices and misfortunes of this world, (vii. 23: viii. 15).

IV. Discourse: Chap. viii. 16—xii. 7.—As the providence of God in the allotment of human destinies is, and will ever remain, unfathomable, and apparently has little or no reference to the moral and religious conduct of men in this world (viii. 16; ix. 16), and as there are no other means for the wise man to preserve his peace of soul in presence of the arrogance, impudent assumption, and violence of fortunate and powerful fools, than godly patience, silence, and tranquility (ix. 17; x. 20): therefore benevolence, fidelity to duty, a contented and serene enjoyment of life, and sincere fear of God from early youth to advanced age, are the only true way to happiness in this world and the world beyond, (xi. 1; xii. 7).

Epilogue: Chap. xii. 8–14. This contains a comprehensive view of the whole, and a recommendation of the truths therein taught, with reference as well to the personal worth of the author (9-11), as to the serious and important contents of his teachings (12-14).

Each of these principal divisions falls into subdivisions, already indicated by the preceding scheme, and within these are again separate paragraphs or verses. These smaller divisions are either marked by the mere inward progress of the thought, or by certain other external signs, as here and there by peculiar, cumulative, closing sentences, (i. 15: i. 18; ii. 11, 19, 23, 26), or also by like formulas and turns in the beginning (*e. g.* by the opening formula: "I saw:" iii. 10, 16; iv. 1, 7, 15), or by other similar expressions and sentences (*e. g.* vii. 26; viii. 5, 12). In accordance with this the first discourse contains three divisions (i. 1-11; i. 12, till ii. 19; ii. 20, 26), of which *the first* has three, the second six, and the third two strophes. *The second* discourse consists of three divisions (iii. 1-22; iv. 1-16; iv. 17: v. 19), each of three strophes; *the third* of three divisions, (vi. 1-12; vii. 1-22; vii. 23; viii. 15), of which the first counts two, the second and third each of three strophes; *the fourth* of three divisions, of three strophes each, (viii. 16-19; ix. 17, till x. 20; xi. 1; xii. 7). The conclusion comprises two strophes or also half strophes (xii. 9-11; xii. 12-14), together with a shorter proposition (xii. 8). More about this division into strophes may be found in Vaihinger, *Ecclesiastes* and *Song of Solomon*, pp. 26–44 (also in *Studien und Kritiken*, 1848, 11); and in Haevernick, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, edited by Keil, Vol. III. p. 438 ff.

Observation 1.

With the arrangement of the contents of Ecclesiastes above given, which we designate according to its principal representatives, as that of Vaihinger and Keil, correspond most nearly the divisions of Köster (*the Book of Job and Ecclesiastes*, Schleswig, 1831), of H. A. Hahn (*Comment. on Ecclesiastes of Solomon*, 1860), and of Ewald (The *Poetical Books of the Old Testament*, 1 ed. iv. 193; 2 ed. 11, 284 ff.). That of the latter, to which Heiligstedt subscribes, (*Commentar. in Eccl. et Cant. Cantic.* 1848), corresponds almost exactly with the one accepted by us, only that the second of the four discourses laid down in it, extends from iii. 1 till vi. 9, (and consequently the third from vi. 10—viii. 15),—which seems scarcely in harmony with the subordinance of the new thought beginning with vi. 10. Ewald and Heiligstedt also avoid, without sufficient reason, a more special classification of the separate discourses, according to

Digitized by Google

strophes and sections. Köster, who also accepts four principal divisions or discourses, has attempted a more special division into strophes, but in the whole, as in the individual parts, indulges in many arbitrary assertions. His divisions are a, introduction: 1, 2–11, consisting of a proposition as a theme, and two strophes; b. I. Sec.: i. 12, 13, 22, containing eight strophes; c. II. Sec.: iv. 1–6, 12, containing nine strophes; d. III. Sec.: vii. 1–9, 16, containing nine strophes; e. IV. Sec. ix. 17–12, 8, of eight strophes; f. conclusion: xii. 9–14, of two strophes. Hahn makes nearly the same classification, only he extends the third part merely to ix. 10, instead of to ix. 16, and adds the introduction I. 2–11 to part 1.—Of the remaining modes of classification we notice the following: * M. Geier: Solomon tells I. wherein happiness does not consist; and this 1) from his own experience (1, 2); 2) from the experiences of others, namely, a. from the change in the times (3) b. from the character of persons, of the unjust, the envious, the avaricious, and of godless kings and the rich, (4, 5), c. from the uncertainty of earthly things, α. of wealth (6, 7), β. from the arrangement of human as well as divine things (8, 9); II. wherein true happiness consists, 1) in upright conduct towards superiors (10); 2) in beneficence towards the poor (11); 3) in the fear of God (12).

Sebastian Schmidt: Three parts: I. Treatise concerning the highest good, 1) negative, showing wherein it does not consist (i. 2–3, 11); 2) positive, wherein it is to be placed (iii. 12–14); II. six instances by which man may be prevented from obtaining the highest good (iii. 15 till iv. 16); III. guide to the true worship of God, and the way to happiness, contained in fourteen rules of conduct (iv. 17; xii. 7), together with a summary (xii. 8–14).

Starke: Three parts: I. wherein the highest good is not to be found (i. 2 till iii. 11); II. wherein it is to be found (iii. 12; iv. 16); III. of our demeanor after finding this good, taught in fourteen rules (iv. 17 till xii. 7); then the close, (thus differing but little from the previous division).

Oetinger: Two parts: One must not let himself be driven by the prevalence of vain things into folly, avarice, and temerity (chap. i. 7); II. one should not be led astray by vanity from the fear of God (chap. viii. 12).

Paulus: As the former, only pointing out that in chap. 1–7 Solomon speaks, and in chap. 8–12 another person answers him.—Van der Palm: Two parts: I. Theoretical part: illustration of the vanity of human endeavors (chap. 1–6); II. practical part: rules that are to be followed under such circumstances (chap. 7-12). J. Dav. Michaelis: I. Theoretical part: the great insufficiency of the happiness of a man left to himself, and isolated from God (i. 2; iv. 16); II. practical part: the means leading to a true and lasting happiness in this life (iv. 17; xii. 14); the first of these parts containing four, and the second six subdivisions.—Fr. Seiler: As the preceding, only that he accords to the theoretical part six, but to the practical part eleven subdivisions. So also Rosenmüller and others.

Mendelsohn: Thirteen sections: 1) chap. i. 1-11; 2) chap. i. 12; ii. 11; 3) chap. ii. 12-26; 4) chap. iii. 1; iv. 3; 5) chap. iv. 4-16; 6) chap. iv. 17; v. 19; 7) chap. vi. 1; vii. 14; 8) chap. vii. 15; viii. 9; 9) chap. viii. 10; ix. 12; 10) chap. ix. 13; x. 15; 11) chap. x. 16; xi. 6; 12) chap. xi. 7, till xii. 7; 13) chap. xii. 8–14.

E. Chr. Schmidt: also thirteen sections: but which correspond with the preceding in scarcely any point, and of which the last, chap. xii. 8-14, is regarded as the addition of a younger hand. Knobel and Umbreit take the same position; (consult the following paragraph concerning them and other contestants of the genuineness of the conclusion, chap. xii. 8-14).

Hitzig: Three main divisions: I. The theoretical foundation, or investigation for the reader regarding the situation (chap. i. 2; iv. 16); II. Recommendation to enjoy the pleasures of life cheerfully, with various provisions and restrictions (iv. 17; viii. 15); III. Positive and direct illustration of what it is salutary for man to do, or development of the principles of a genuine and practical wisdom, (viii. 16 till xii. 14).

R. Stier: Introductory Preface (chap. i. 2-11), and then three main divisions: I. To the natural man all is vanity; he falls into confusion and trouble, as long as he does not look to God, (chap. i. 12; vii. 30); II. Various passages alluding in various ways to the foregoing, but illuminating everything with the light found in the first part (viii. 1; xi. 10); III. The teaching

* For the titles of the expositions here quoted, comp. § 6.

Digitized by Google

of the Book, "Regard thy Creator before thou becomest old, for this yields an immortality;" together with conclusion and recapitulation (xii. 1-14);—each of these principal divisions falls into several subdivisions; the first into four, the second into three, and the third likewise into three.

FR. DE ROUGEMENT: Two main divisions of very unequal length: I. Philosophical discourse (i. 2; xii. 10); II. inspired teaching (xii. 11-14). The first of these parts is introduced by the presentation of the problem to be solved, (i. 2-11), and then divided into three books: 1) the vanities of human existence (i. 12; iv. 16); 2) the human conditions of happiness (v. 1; vii. 14); 3) the divine conditions of happiness (vii. 15; xi. 6): each of these books is again divided into three or four paragraphs, and the last is accompanied by a special conclusion: "life and death," (xi. 7; xii. 10).

A. F. C. VILMAR: Seven divisions (mainly for practical utility). I. General introduction: everything on earth is transitory, and returneth to the place whence it came, *etc.* (chap. i.); II. *deeds* in life are vanity; God alone carries their success in his hand; we see no profit of our labors, and no result of our life (ii. 1; iii. 15); III. to expect a *recompense* on earth, is a deceptive hope (iii. 16; v. 8); IV. *riches*, with all that they are permitted to accomplish and effect, are vain and transitory (v. 9; vii. 9); V. *wisdom* on earth is no avail, for it can find out much but not all things, and the end of the wise man is (externally) like the end of the fool (vii. 10 till x. 4); VI. *result:* our unsuccessful labors, the inequality of the things of the world, the nothingness of riches, and the insufficiency of worldly wisdom must not deceive us in what we have to do in our narrow circle, and least of all the youth (x. 5; xii. 7); VII. *conclusion:* repeated summary of the result more circumstantially given in No. VI.

OBSERVATION 2.

Many commentators deny that there is any evidence of a well-arranged and systematic train of thought, and have considered the book an immethodical collection of individual thoughts, views and expressions, that have simply a loose connection by the assertion that all is vanity, and for whose grouping the usual division into chapters presents a sufficient means. This is the view of the older commentators, as also of LUTHER, MELANCHTHON, DRUSIUS, MERCERUS, BAUER, HANSEN, SPOHN, *etc.*, and it yet appears in the most recent period of ELSTER, and HENGSTENBERG. The two latter form, it is true, certain sections, and groups of verses in the course of their exegesis of the book, but bring these divisions together in no unitary and well-arranged scheme. GURLITT (*Studies and Criticisms of the Book of* KOHELETH, 1865, II. 321 ff.) has also declared this book "anything but a systematically arranged writing, to bring whose contents in the form of a logical scheme, would be a fruitless undertaking."—Even those exegetists who see a colloquial character in the book, aim at no regular arrangement of its contents, and consider the whole, therefore, as a conversation or disputation between the representatives of two antagonistic views. A few older commentators inclined to this view, especially HIERONYMUS (comp. *e. g.* his remarks on chap. ix. 7, 8); "*et hæc, inquit, aliquis loquatur Epicurus et Aristippus et Cyrenaici,*" and other similar passages, which show a certain inclination to a dramatizing of the contents, and Gregory the Great, who (*Dialog. IV.* 4), seems to give the book almost directly the character of a dramatic colloquy between Solomon and various opponents of his religious views. Among the moderns these views are represented by the Englishman, Matt. Poole, (*Annotations on the Bible*, London, 1683), F. GEARD, (*a Paraphrase on Ecclesiastes*, London, 1701), of whom the latter considers: That the Preacher introduces a refined sensualist or a sensual worldling, who interrupts him, in order to attack and ridicule his doctrine. This colloquial hypothesis has received its most refined form from HERDER and EICHHORN. According to HERDER's eleventh letter on theological study, there are to be distinguished in the book two voices, that of a hypercritic who seeks truth in the tone of one speaking in the first person, and mostly ends with the assertion that all is vanity, whilst another voice in the tone of "Thou," often interrupts him, represents to him the temerity of his investigations, and mostly ends with the question: what remains as the result of a whole life? It is not fully question and answer, doubt and solution, but something that out of the same mouth resembles both, and is distinguished by interruptions and continuations. One can therefore divide the book into two co-

Digitized by Google

lumns, of which one belongs to the exhausted seeker, and the other to the warning teacher. Under these two columns HERDER distributes the separate sections of the book as follows:

1. THE SEEKER.	2. THE TEACHER.
I. 1–11.	
I. 12–18.	
II. 1–11.	
II. 12–26.	
III. 1–15.	
III. 16–22.	
IV. 1–16.	IV. 17.
	V. 1–8.
V. 9–19.	
VI. 1–11.	
VII. 1.	VII. 2–15.
VII. 16.	VII. 17–23.
VII. 24–33.	
VIII. 1.	VIII. 2–13.
VIII. 14–17.	
IX. 1–3.	IX. 4–10.
IX. 11–18.	
X. 1–3.	X. 4.
X. 5–7.	X. 8–19.
	X. 20.
	XI. 12.

EICHHORN, independent of HERDER, arrived at a very similar view, on the path of more careful critical and scientific procedure. According to his Introduction to the Old Testament (III. 648 ff) two kinds of persons clearly alternate in the book, a contemplator, observer, investigator, who regards with gloomy eyes the life and destiny of men, and in youthful fervor exaggerates the deductions from his observations and seldom does justice to the good of this world; by his side stands an aged man of wisdom, who tempers the fire of ardent youth, and brings him back to the path of truth beyond which he in his excitement has hurried, and even shows how evil has a good side. The former ends with the lamentation that all is vanity, the latter with the deductions that a wise man will draw from the course of the world. In sympathy with this EICHHORN's divisions are:

1. THE SEEKER.	2. THE TEACHER.
I. 2; IV. 16.	IV. 17; V. 11.
V. 12; VI. 12.	VII. 1–14.
VII. 15.	VII. 16–22.
VII. 23–29.	VIII. 1–8.
VIII. 9; IX. 6.	IX. 7–10.
IX. 11–18.	X. 1–4.
X. 5–7.	X. 8; XII. 7.
CONCLUSION: XII. 8–14.	

Similar, but deviating frequently in details, is the view of BERGST, in EICHHORN's Repertory, X. 963 ff. From these efforts at introducing dialogues, in which but one thing can be acknowledged as true and tenable, namely, that in some few passages the author introduces his opponent as speaking, in order immediately to contradict them (see above § 1, Obs. 2, towards the end) there is clearly only one step to that view which regards the whole as a compilation of various investigations, reflections, and songs or sententious poems of Israelitish philosophers, a view directly destructive to the unity of the book; as is done by DÖDERLEIN and NACHTIGAL in connection with their already mentioned peculiar explanations of the name KOHELETH by "session, assembly" (comp. § 1, Obs. 1). According to this view of DÖDERLEIN, presented in his *scholia in libros poeticos* V. T., t. 1, (1779), but at a later period (*Solomon's Song, and Ec-*

Digitized by Google

clesiastes, 1784) again rejected and opposed, (which however found a so much more zealous and determined advocate in NACHTIGAL) the whole is a collection by some later hand of various philosophical and didactic poems, sayings of wise men, obscure questions, together with their solutions, and a few additions in prose. The entire contents are classified therefore in eight divisions, together with a supplement:

I. SECTION: Poems (i. 2; iv. 16);
II. " Proverbs (iv. 17; v. 8);
III. " Poems (v. 9; vi. 9);
IV. " Proverbs (vi. 10; vii 22);
V. " Obscure questions and their solution (vii. 23; viii. 7);
VI. " Poems (viii. 8; x. 1);
VII. " Proverbs (x. 2; xi. 6);
VIII. " Poems (xi. 7; xii. 7).
SUPPLEMENT: Additions in prose (xii. 8–14).

This view, as well on account of its denial of all connection between the individual parts, as of progressive thought within them, falls into the class of those expositions which are capable of vindicating a logically arrayed train of ideas in the book only at the sacrifice of its unity. With these the following paragraph will be more especially occupied.

OBSERVATION 3.

As to the literary *form* of the book, its close connection with that of the older Maschal poetry in the Proverbs, and its occasional transition into complete prose, comp. especially EWALD, *Poets of the Old Testament*, p. 285 f.: "It is not to be denied that our didactic poet has much that is delicate and refined in expression, and finished in the composition of individual thoughts and proverbs, such as one would scarcely have expected at this late and depressed period. A genuine poetic spirit pervades everything;—our poet understands how to give a poetic mould to the most brittle material, to bring the most distant fields into clear view, to unite the most dissonant elements, to smooth what is rough, and either harmlessly to bend the views to be opposed, or get rid of them before they become too marked. But in one direction he far surpasses the limit even of the freest of the earlier proverbial poetry, and creates something entirely new. *He no longer gives every where pure poetic lines, but lets the discourse here and there be concluded, without retaining the strict law of metrical construction.* When he desires to interpolate in his freer reflection something purely historical, he dispenses with the restraint of poetic measure (e. g. i. 12; ii. 4 ff.; ix. 13–15); for in the process of accurate and clear thought, many things may be expressed most curtly and sharply without the trammel of measure. Thus there is found in our poet a variegated form of discourse, and he is also creative as a composer of proverbs. The Arabs understand this change from verse to prose in many half poetic works, and in the Indian drama it is universal· even in the prophets of the Old Testament we find much that is similar, and thus it became so much the more easy for this poet to yield to it. When the thought soars, the pure height of poetic style always appears with him (comp. as example of the highest poetic flight especially chap. xii. 1–6). But especially where teaching and admonition appear, there the language rises to the sharp brevity and genuine character of the ancient proverb; to this our later poet has clearly devoted all care and skill, so that it also in this production beams forth in the highest beauty. It is neatly polished, sharply stamped, briefly and pointedly completed; and he especially rejoices in retaining the old style of genuine Hebrew speech, whilst this is already inclined to lower itself to the more modern language of intercourse. It appears thus separately intertwined, or in series; either in strictest poetic style, or in somewhat weakened fetters, but may even then be recognized by the pure doctrine that it imparts. Where several proverbs follow each other, there are formed well connected links of a strong chain of thought, which separates into its parts: but such a chain has at most seven parts or individual proverbs (iv. 17; v. 6; vii. 1–7; vii. 8–14), so that we can here every where in the entire composition recognize the significance of the old Hebrew strophes. For the whole construction of each of the four separate discourses of the book clings to the structure of strophes,

Digitized by Google

and nowhere oversteps the limits of this structure." With reference to the limits of these strophes, EWALD differs in many particulars from VAIHINGER and KEIL, whom we in this respect have followed as in the paragraph above; just as KÖSTER, who first perceived and pointed out the strophical arrangement of the book in general, differs from the three others in various respects. This uncertainty regarding many of the specialties of the strophical construction, need not mislead us as to the fact in general, nor carry us to the view taken by HENGSTENBERG, BLEEK, KAHNIS, *etc.*, that the character of the style of the book is entirely without form and plan. Comp. VAIH., Art. Solomon the Preacher, in HERZOG's *Real-Encyclopedia*, Vol. XII. p. 100 ff.

§ 3. UNITY AND INTEGRITY.

That Ecclesiastes forms one connected whole, appears from the uniform character of its language, and the universal reference of its individual sentences and expressions to the fundamental thought of the vanity of all earthly things. It appears also from the unmistakable progress of its reflections throughout the whole, as it goes on from the unharmonious incongruity of the beginning to the increasing clearness, certainty and confidence of the final judgment. However one may regard the internal law of this progress, and in accordance with it interpret the plan and order of the whole, it cannot be doubted, in the main, that it is a work from one mould, and that only isolated inequalities and coarse asperities of structure remain for the candid critical observer, a characteristic peculiarity of the book which can by no means be denied, and which may not, without farther regard, be explained as a defect of rhetoric or style (see § 1, Obs. 2). In just appreciation of this peculiarity, nearly all the latest exegetists have opposed the hypercritical procedure of their predecessors, towards the end of the last century, extending to the arbitrary dismemberment and mutilation of the whole (*e. g.*, SPOHN, SCHMIDT, NACHTIGAL, PAULUS, STÄUDLIN, and partially, also, GROTIUS and WHISTON), and have, at the same time, with the internal uniformity and continuity of the style, also acknowledged the integrity of the traditional text. Only in reference to the closing section (chap. xii. 8–14) has it been doubted down to the latest period by certain expositors, whether this may be regarded as an authentic and integral part of the whole. But even these doubts have justly been rejected by the most, as unfounded, because the pretended contradiction which the doctrine of happiness, immortality and judgment as found in this closing part presents to that of the book itself, is merely apparent, and because the circumstance, that therein Koheleth is spoken of, not as formerly in the first, but in the third person, is by no means an isolated case, but has in i. 2 and vii. 27 perfect analogies preceding it.

OBSERVATION.

Concerning NACHTIGAL's strange experiments in tracing back the contents to divers wholly unconnected compositions and aphorisms, see previous Paragraph 2, Obs. 2. H. GROTIUS* is to be named as the earliest representative of this mutilating method, which in many respects reminds us of HERDER's, EICHHORN's, and MAGNUS' treatment of the Song of Solomon. The former, in his *Annotationes in V. T.*, describes the origin of Ecclesiastes in these words: "*redactas esse in hunc librum varias hominum, qui apud suos quisque habebantur, opiniones,* περὶ τῆς εὐδαιμονίας, *quare mirari non debemus, si quædem hic legimus non probanda; omnes enim sententias cum suis argumentis recitanti necesse erat id accidere.*" He strangely imagined ZERUBBABEL to be the instigator of the collecting of these proverbs. "*Qui hæc colligerent ac sub persona Solomonis in unum corpus congererent, mandatum habuerunt ab uno pastore, i. e., ut puto, Zorobabele, qui ob res tenues Judæorum et Persici imperii reverentiam, regem se dicere non ausus, quamquam inter suos pro rege habebatur, nomen usurpavit modestius Pastoris*" (*Annot. ad c.* xii. 11).—Besides NACHTIGAL and (for a while) DÖDERLEIN, it was especially H. E. G. PAULUS (*Comment.*, 1790) and STÄUDLIN (*History of the Moral Teachings of Jesus*, I., 1799), who maintained towards the end of the last century the fragmentary and compilatory character of the book, at the same time with its post-Solomonic origin; and each in his peculiar way; PAU-

* Many trace to LUTHER the assertion of a post-Solomonic origin of Ecclesiastes, carrying it back to several collectors, but this occurs solely on the basis of his "Preface" of the year 1524, not of his Annotationes in Ecclesiastes of 1532, a far more thoughtful and conservative work of a calmer and maturer period. Comp. § 5.

Digitized by Google

LUS inclining to the view of HERDER, *i. e.*, of a dialogue between scholar and teacher; STÄUDLIN, with the effort to trace as many things as possible to Solomon himself as originator. The vacillating and doubtful condition of Solomon towards the end of his life he has depicted in isolated paragraphs, which a later Hebrew found, and from them took the main material of which he composed the book, as from certain hitherto uncollected sayings of Solomon. This collector then added in his own name some remarks at the end of the book, by which the fate of the whole is indicated, and some account of the origin of the book is given.—This hypothesis of STÄUDLIN forms the transition to the second principal form in which the critical efforts directed against the unity of the book have appeared. This consists in the acceptance of one author, perhaps Solomon, who wrote *at various times* the single paragraphs, sayings and reflections which form the book, and finally united them into one rather unfinished and unharmonious whole. Thus, at first, WM. WHISTON († 1752), who, under the supposition of Solomonic authorship, says: "*in librum Ecclesiastæ tamquam in unum systema redactas esse plures Solomonis observationes, super rebus gravissimi momenti, sed factas diversis temporibus, ut longe maxima pars ab eo perfecta sit, quum solius Jehovæ cultui addictus de vera religione bene sentiret, nonnullæ autem, cum per illecebras voluptatum ab hoc cultu desci visset.*" Thus also J. CHR. SCHMIDT (1794), according to whom the book, as it appears, consists of paragraphs written in various moods and times, and does not yet seem a book fully finished for the public, but rather a mere sketch drawn up (!) by the author for himself, as a guide for further labor. And there are several similar exegetists about this time, namely, MIDDLEDORPF (1811), also SPOHN (1785), according to whom the book consists of moral sentences which more or less cherish genuine reverence of God, and call attention to His wisdom in the government of the world, in order thereby to lead to a firm trust in God, to alienate the mind from the world, direct it to virtue, *etc.;* and in the same strain writes ZIRKEL (1792), to whom the whole appears as a reading book for the young inhabitant of the world, *etc.*—This view, denying the unity and integrity of the book, appears in its most modest form, and with the greatest semblance of scientific support in VAN DER PALM, DÖDERLEIN, BERTHOLDT, HERZFELD, KNOBEL, and UMBREIT, who think the unity only here and there destroyed by certain changes of the text, alterations, and interpolations, or at least consider the closing section (chap. xii. 8–14) as a later addition, either of the author himself (as HERZFELD) or of a later interpolator (as BERTH., KNOB., UMBR., *etc.*). In support of this latter view, KNOBEL says: 1) the whole addition is superfluous, because the author in xii. 8 (which verse KNOBEL still considers genuine) brings the whole to a satisfactory conclusion; 2) Koheleth is not therein introduced, as in the book itself, in the first person speaking of himself, but he is referred to as a third person; 3) the thought of a future judgment of God in verse 14 contradicts the earlier denial of immortality on the part of the author; 4) presenting the fear of God and piety as the aim of all wisdom does not comport with the earlier recommendation of a gladsome, sensual enjoyment of life; 5) the expression in verse 12 that "of the making of many books there is no end," does not accord with the epoch of Koheleth, since this period, that of Persian rule, is rather supposed to have been poor in the literary activity of the Jews. None of these reasons will stand a test. For to the 1) a very clear and expressive prominence of the principal didactic thoughts was by no means superfluous, in the obscure and casual way in which these had been previously expressed (*e. g.*, xi. 9); to the 2) Koheleth is spoken of in the third person already in the i. 2; vii. 27, and even in verse 8 of the 12th chapter, recognized by KNOBEL as genuine; and again, the fact that an author alternately speaks of himself in the first and third person has its analogies in other fields (*e. g.*, Sir. l. 29 ff.; to the 3 and 4), neither the doctrine of happiness, nor that of immortality and retribution is at variance with the corresponding views and principles of that closing section, since the eudemonism (or blessedness) previously taught is by no means partial, sensual, or even epicurean, but is rather coupled with frequent direct and indirect exhortations to piety (see iii. 14; v. 6; viii. 12 f.), and since the final judgment in chap. xi. 9 has been specially and clearly enough alluded to (comp. § 5). In regard to the 5th, the presumption of a comparative literary inactivity and unproductiveness of the Jews of the Persian period is destitute of all proof, as the learned activity of the elders of the synagogue, and the collectors and multipliers of the sacred writings beginning with Ezra, proves; but since the author, as is probable from other signs, possessed a learned culture extending beyond the circle of

Digitized by Google

Israelitish writings (see the following paragraph), and consequently "with the making of many books," was thinking of the literary activity of the Greeks, Persians, Egyptians (for whose immense religious and profane literature, even in the pre-Alexandrine age, comp. *Diodorus Siculus*, I., 49), and other contemporary nations, therefore the expression in question proves more for than against the appropriateness of that part to the whole. Two arguments also of UMBREIT against the genuineness of the section are decidedly untenable; one consisting in the marked self-laudation of the author in verses 9 and 11, and the other in the pretended change of expression and tone of the discourse from verse 8 onward. For the laudatory expressions of the author concerning his own wisdom and learning have their complete and significant parallel in Prov. ii. 1–15; iii. 1 ff.; iv. 1 ff.; v. 1 ff.; vii. 1 ff.; in Job xxxii. 6–19; in Sirach l. 30; and indeed in many earlier expressions of Koheleth himself, as i. 16; ii. 3; vii. 23;—and the change of diction from verses 8 or 9 is simply an internal one, affecting the tone of the discourse and not the individual linguistic peculiarities, and is therefore satisfactorily explained by the essential contrast existing between the epilogue and the contents of the first part (comp. *e. g.*, also Sir. l. 29–31, with the foregoing; and also 2 Macc. xv. 38–40; John xx. 30, 31, *etc.*). One need not even consider (with HERZFELD) xii. 9–14 as a later addition from the author's *own hand* to his book. For if, indeed, verse 9 treated of a later activity of Koheleth, this would only then prove a later addition of the section, if Koheleth, *i. e.*, Solomon, were the real and not the pretended author of the book. As for the rest, UMBREIT, apart from his exclusion of the ending as a false addition, has decidedly defended and maintained the unity and continuity of all the preceding; comp. his valuable treatise on the "Unity of the Book of Koheleth," *Studien und Kritiken*, 1857, i. 1–56. Next to him, of the latest exegetists, EWALD, VAIHINGER and ELSTER have done the best service in proving the unitary character and integrity of the book. Compare what the last named of these beautifully as strikingly remarks concerning this subject (*Preface*, Sec. III. f.): "As in landscapes, whose forms, in consequence of previous struggles of contending elements, contrast in a manner apparently lawless and wild, the eternal law of all natural formation is stamped, but in another form; thus the Divine impulse that appears to every candid mind in the book of Koheleth, cannot be wanting in regularity and unity in its revelation. Although permeated by the most ardent contest of a human heart full of inward glow, it presents in the forms of its revelation, and in consequence of this previous strife, something of the not entirely lawless dismemberment of a volcanic region. Yes, as landscapes of this kind present to the eye of the artist an especially rich material with which to express his indwelling idea of beauty in bold and stupendous forms, so may we say that the sublimity of the Divine mind is most deeply felt in the rough and dismembered form of the book of Koheleth."

§ 4. EPOCH AND AUTHOR.

Neither the title nor the contents of this book can be used to sustain the traditional opinion that Solomon is the author of it (though it presents the fundamental features of the physics of Solomon, as the proverbs those of his ethics, and the Song those of his logic—comp. the general introduction to the Solomonic writings, § 1, Obs.). For the manner in which the self-designating Koheleth speaks of himself, chap. i. 1; xii. 16, as the Son of David and King of Jerusalem, and then attributes to himself works, undertakings, and qualities, whose originator and bearer history teaches to be Solomon alone (ii. 4 till xii. 15; viii. 9 ff.; comp. § 2), indicates rather a literary fiction and an artful self-transposition of the author into the place of Solomon, than the direct Solomonic authorship. For the author says i. 12: that he, Koheleth, has been king in Jerusalem, and speaks, vii. 15, of the "days of his vanity," as if he had long been numbered with the dead! And again, what he says of himself, i. 16; ii. 7, 9: that he was wiser and richer *than all before him in Jerusalem*, points, under unbiassed exposition, clearly to an author different from the historical Solomon; and, moreover, the allusions to his prosperity, as not less the boasting expressions regarding his own wisdom in i. 16; ii. 3, 9, and finally the remarks in reference to him as a person belonging to history, vii. 27; xii. 9–11, are scarcely in harmony with the authorship of Solomon the son and successor of David. And that also which is said, vii. 10, of the depravity of the times, accords as little with the age of Solomon, the most brilliant and prosperous of Israelitish history, as the manner in which, iv. 13–16; v. 7 ff.; viii. 2–10; x. 4 ff.; 16 ff.,

Digitized by Google

it is spoken of princes and kings, indicates the man as speaker who himself is king. And altogether unkingly sound the complaints in iii. 17; iv. 1; x. 5–7 concerning unjust judges, violent tyrants, officers given to imposition, and slaves and fools elevated to high offices and honors, *etc.;* these are all lamentations and complaints natural enough in a suffering and oppressed subject, but not in a monarch called and authorized to abolish the evils (comp. Obs. 1).

To these references to an author other than Solomon, and an origin considerably later than the Solomonic period, may be added also the linguistic peculiarities of the book, which point with great definiteness to an epoch after the exile. Compared with the prosaic and poetic diction of writings antecedent to the exile, that of this book shows a comprehensive breadth and superfluity of Aramaic words, forms, particles and significations only comparable with similar appearances of well-known productions of post-exile literature, *e. g.*, the Books of Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, the earliest prophetic writings. The linguistic character of the book is, on the whole, in such direct contrast with that of the genuine and old Solomonic writings, especially of the constituent parts of the Proverbs, and in the use and formation of certain favorite philosophical expressions, that these isolated contacts with the old Solomonic thesaurus and custom are necessarily attributable to a direct use of these older writings on the part of the author; while in other regards a most radical difference is observable in the two spheres of language and observation. We condemn, however, as an unscientific subterfuge, the opinion of some that Solomon purposely used in Ecclesiastes the Chaldaic mode of expression of the philosophers of his age (comp. Obs. 2).

For a more exact determining of the person of the author, and the epoch in which he wrote, the descriptions given by him of the religious and moral conditions of his nation and its cotemporaries, offer some hints and assistance. According to iv. 17; v. 5 and ix. 2, the temple worship was assiduously practiced, but without a living piety of heart, and in a hypocritical and self-justifying manner; the complaints in this regard remind us vividly of similar ones of the prophet Malachi (*e. g.*, Mal. i. 6 to ii. 9; iii. 7 ff.), with whose book, moreover, our own comes in striking contact in some points of language, namely, in the use of the expression הַמַּלְאָךְ "the angel" in the sense of "priest" (chap. v. 5; comp. מַלְאַךְ יְהוָה Mal. ii. 7). Other expressions of the author, regarding the religious, moral, and social vices and evils of his age, remind us of the lamentations of Ezra and Nehemiah in reference to the misery under the Persian Satraps, *e. g.*, what he says about the decline of public justice (iii. 17), the violent oppression of the innocent (iv. 1; vii. 5), the perversion of judgment in the provinces (v. 8), the advancement of idle, incapable, and purchasable men to high honors and places (vii. 7; x. 5–7; xvii. 19), the debauchery of officers and lofty ones of the realm (x. 16–19), informers and secret police (x. 20), the increase of immoral, unrighteous, and selfish conduct of the great multitude (iv. 4, 8; v. 9; viii. 10, 11; ix. 3). The harmony of these passages with much that is similar in the books of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther (comp. *e. g.*, Ez. iv. 1 ff.; ix. 1 ff.; Neh. i. 3 ff.; ii. 10, 19; iii. 33 ff; iv. 1 ff.; xiii. 10 ff.; Esth. iii. 1 ff.; v. 9 ff.), is the more significant because our book uses in common with these very literary productions of the Persian period a word indisputably Persian, (פִּתְגָם edict, command, chap. viii. 11; comp. Ez. iv. 17; Esth. i. 20, *etc.*). There is no exact indication in the book of a later period of authorship than that of the books of Nehemiah and Malachi, or than the last decades of the fifth century before Christ,—neither in the gloomy view of the world and the melancholy philosophy of the author extending at times to inconsolable doubts of Providence, which might have been easily indulged in immediately after the exile,—nor in the complaint about the making of many books (chap. xii. 12), to which by no means the last period of Persian rule should be the first to offer an inducement, nor finally in the apparent controversy against Pharisaical, Sadducean and Essæan principles (iv. 17; v. 6; vii. 2–6; ix. 2); for this is a controversy which in truth refers only to the germs and additions of the mode of thinking of these parties extant since the exile, or since the period immediately preceding the exile, and not referring to the life and doctrine of these sect-like parties as they were in the last century before Christ. The fact that this book hints no where in the slightest at the political condition of the Jewish people under the Ptolemaic and Seleucidan rulers, and

Digitized by Google

not less the fact that it has been accepted in the canon of the Old Testament, while the book of Sirach, composed soon after the commencement of the Macedonian rule, was excluded from it, as from an already finished collection, testifies pretty clearly against the composition of the book in so late a post-Persian period (comp. Obs. 3).

If this book may therefore be very probably considered as about contemporary with Nehemiah and Malachi, or between 450 and 400, then we may find the inducement and aim of its production in the fact that the sad condition of his nation, and the unfortunate state of the times, led the author to the presentation of grave reflections as to the vanity of all earthly things, and to the search after that which, in view of this vanity, could afford him consolation and strength of faith, and the same to other truth-loving minds led by the sufferings of the present into painful inward strife and doubts. The result of these reflections, the author—a God-fearing Israelite, belonging to the caste of the Chakamim, or wise teachers of that time (chap. xii. 9-11; comp. 1 Kings iv. 31), whose personal relations cannot be more clearly defined, thought to bring most fittingly to the knowledge and appropriation of his contemporaries, by presenting King Solomon, the most distinguished representative of the Israelitish Chakamim, and the original ideal conception of all celebrated wise men of the Old Testament, as a teacher of the people, with the vanity of earthly things as his theme. And he puts into the mouth of this kingly preacher of wisdom (Koheleth—comp. § 1) as his *alter ego*, mainly two practical and religious deductions from that theme; 1) the principle that while renouncing the traditional belief of a temporal adjustment of Divine justice and human destinies, we must seek our earthly happiness only in serene enjoyments, connected with wise moderation and lasting fidelity to our trusts; and 2) the exhortation to a cheerful confidence in the hope of a heavenly adjustment between happiness and virtue, and to a godly and joyous looking to this future and just tribunal of God (comp. Obs. 4).

OBSERVATION 1.

The Talmud seems to express a certain doubt of the traditional Jewish and Christian view, that Solomon himself wrote this book when it, *Baba Vathra*, f. 14, 15 (comp. *Schalschelleth Hakkabala*, f. 66), makes the assertion that Hezekiah and his philosophers (Prov. xxv. 1) wrote Isaiah, Proverbs, the Song of Solomon, and Ecclesiastes. But this assertion does not so much regard the actual composition of these books as their final revision and introduction into the Canon; the origin of their entire contents from the authors named, and consequently their authenticity in the strict sense of the word, is not called into question. Of a more serious character are the objections raised by LUTHER against the Solomonic origin of Ecclesiastes. In his preface to the German translation of this book, written in 1524, he says: "The book was not written or arranged by King Solomon himself with his own hand, but was heard from his mouth by others, and collected by the learned men. As they themselves finally confess when they say: These words of the philosophers are spears and nails, arranged by the masters of the congregation, and presented by one shepherd; *i. e.*, certain chosen ones at that time were ordered by kings and people, this and other books of Solomon, presented to the one shepherd, so to place and arrange, that no one should have need to make books according to his desire; as they therein complain that of book-making there is no end, and forbid others to undertake it. Such people are called the masters of the congregation, so that the books must be accepted and ratified by their hand and office. For the Jewish people had an external government established by God, in order that these things might be surely and justly arranged. Thus also the book of the Proverbs of Solomon was put together by others, and at the close the teachings and sayings of some wise men were added. Thus also the Song of Solomon seems like a pieced book, taken by others from his mouth. Therefore also is there no order in these books, but one part is mingled with the other, since they did not hear all at one period, nor at once, as must be the way with such books."—He judges still more boldly about the same book in one of those casual remarks of his "*Table Talk*," to which, however, he would himself scarcely have given any scientific value (WORKS, *Erlangen* Ed., Vol. 62, 128): "This book ought to be more complete; there is too much broken off from it—it has neither boots nor spurs—it rides only in socks, just as I did when in the cloister.—I do not believe that Solomon was damned, but it was thus written to terrify kings, princes and rulers. Thus he did not write Ecclesiastes, but it was composed by

Digitized by Google

Sirach at the time of the Maccabees. But it is a very good and pleasant book, because it has much fine doctrine concerning the household. And, moreover, it is like a Talmud, composed of many books, perhaps from the library of King Ptolemy Evergetis in Egypt. As also the Proverbs of Solomon were brought together by others," *etc.*—Luther seems by no means to have always entertained this opinion of the book, disputing its authenticity as well as its unity; in his Latin Commentary at least (Ecclesiastes, *Solomonis cum annotationibus*, 1532, Ed. Erlang., Lat. T., XXI., p. 1 ss.), he presents the immediate hearers and contemporaries of King Solomon, as writing the pronounced contents of Koheleth: "*Titulum Ecclesiastæ sive concionatoris magis referendum puto ad ipsius libri, quam ad autoris nomen, ut intelligas hæc esse verba per Salomonem publice dicta in concione quadam suorum principum et aliorum. Cum enim rex esset, non erat sui muneris neque officii docere, sed sacerdotum et Levitarum. Quare hæc arbitror dicta a Salomone in conventu quodam suorum, seu a convivio, vel etiam intra convivium, præsentibus aliquot magnis viris et proceribus, postquam apud se diu et multum cogitasset de rerum humanorum s. potius affectuum conditione et vanitate, quæ sic postea (ut fit) illis præsentibus effuderit, deinde ab illis ipsis magistris communitatis vel ecclesia excepta et collecta.—Unde et in fine fatentur hæc se accepisse a pastore uno et congessisse. Sicut nostrum quispiam posset in convivio sedens de rebus humanis disputare, aliis, quod diceretur, excipientibus. Ut scilicet sit publica concio, quam ex Salomone audierint, a qua concione placuit hunc librum Coheleth appellare, non quod Salomon ipse concionator fuerit, sed quod hic liber concionetur, tamquam publicus sermo.*" As the direct Solomonic authorship appears here decidedly retained, so Luther in other places names Solomon without restriction as the immediate author, just as do Melancthon, Brenz, and the other contemporary and next following exegetists throughout. Grotius was the next one to take up again the denial of the Solomonic authenticity, and indeed in a far more distinct and consistent manner than Luther. See the Obs. to the last paragraph, p. 15 f. He sought in some measure to give a scientific foundation to the assertion of a post-Solomonic origin by reference to the later Chaldean style. "*Ego Salomonis non esse puto,*" he says, "*sed scriptum serius sub illius regis tamquam pœnitentis ducti nomine. Argumenta ejus rei habeo multa vocabula, quæ non alibi, quam in Daniele, Esdra et Chaldæis, interpretibus reperias.*" Another opponent of the genuineness of the book appeared then in Herm. v. d. Hardt (*de libro Coheleth*, 1716), who, however, did not, as Grotius, and as subsequently and more decidedly G. Ph. Chr. Kaiser (comp. § 1, Obs. 1), think Zerubbabel to be the author of the book, but his younger contemporary, Jesus, son of the high priest Joiada. Although these rather arbitrary and poorly supported assertions met strong opposition among all contemporaries, and J. D. Michaelis declared himself decidedly in favor of the direct Solomonic origin of the book (*Poetic Outline of the Thoughts of Ecclesiastes of Solomon*, 2d ed., 1762), nevertheless, since the epoch of genuine rationalism, the belief of its composition in a post-exile era, and by a philosopher identified with Solomon by means of free poetic fiction, has become so general, that since that time, even from orthodox quarters, only a rather isolated opposition has appeared. The defence of the Solomonic origin has been attempted by Schelling (*Salomonis quæ supersunt, etc.*, 1806), F. de Rougemont (*Explication du livre de l' Ecclésiaste*, Neuchatel, 1844), H. A. Hahn (*Commentary*, 1860), Wangeman (*Ecclesiastes practically treated according to contents and connection*, 1856), Ed. Böhl (see Obs. 2), and also the Catholics, Welte (Herbst's *Int.*, II., 2, 252 ff.), Ludw. van Essen (*Ecclesiastes, Schaffhausen*, 1856), and others; while the opposite view has found representatives not only in Ewald, Umbreit, Elster, Vaihinger, Bleek (*Int.* to the O. T., p. 641 ff.), H. G. Bernstein (comp. Obs. 3), *etc.*, but also in Hävernick, Keil, Hengstenberg, O. V. Gerlach, Vilmar, Delitzsch, and others.

OBSERVATION 2.

The numerous Aramaisms in the book are among the surest signs of its post-exile origin; of these nearly every verse presents some: For example, אִלּוּ if (vi. 6; Esth. vii. 14); בָּטֵל to cease, rest (xii. 3; Dan. v. 19; Esth. v. 9); זְמָן time (iii. 1; Neh. xi. 6; Esth. ix. 27, 31); כָּשֵׁר to succeed, prosper (x. 10; xi. 10; Esth. viii. 5); מְדִינָה province (xi. 8; v. 7); פִּתְגָם

edict (compare what is said above, (p. 14); פֵּשֶׁר, interpretation, meaning (viii. 1; comp. Dan. xi. 5 ff.); מִבְּלִי אֲשֶׁר לֹא so that not (iii. 11); כָּל־עֻמַּת exactly like (v. 15); שָׁלַט to rule (ii. 19; v. 18; Neh. v. 15; Esth. ix. 1); שִׁלְטוֹן authority, ruler (viii. 4, 8; Dan. iii. 2, 3); תָּקַן to be right (i. 15; vii. 13; xii. 9; comp. Dan. iv. 33); תַּקִּיף powerful (vi. 10; Dan. ii. 40, 42; iii. 3); likewise the particles כְּבָר long since (i. 10; ii. 12, 16); חוּץ מִן without (ii. 25); עַל דִּבְרַת on account of (vii. 19); מַה שֶּׁ what was (i. 9; iii. 15).—Ed. Böhl has lately tried in vain to weaken the testimony against the Solomonic origin of the book, contained in these numerous direct and indirect parallelisms with the books of Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, *etc.* (*Dissertatio de Aramaismis libri Koheleth, qua librum Salomoni vindicare conatur*, Erlang., 1864). To these we may add the many peculiar philosophical expressions, as: יִתְרוֹן advantage, gain, excellence (i. 3; ii. 13); רַעְיוֹן, רְעוּת, חֶשְׁבּוֹן, חֵלֶק, כִּשְׁרוֹן, together with numerous abstract forms in וּת as הֹלֵלוֹת madness (x. 13) סִכְלוּת foolishness (i. 17; ii. 3); שַׁחֲרוּת morning red, youth (xi. 10); שִׁפְלוּת sluggishness (x. 18), *etc.* Where there appear, on the contrary, characteristic expressions and terms from the old Solomonic language, there every time the thought of borrowing is patent. Thus the expression בַּעַל כָּנָף the bird (x. 10; comp. Prov. i. 17); that favorite conception הֶבֶל (i. 2, *etc.;* comp. Prov. xiii. 11; xxi. 6; xxxi. 30); the expression חֹבֵק יָדַיִם fold the hands, as a picture of idleness (iii. 5; iv. 5; comp. Prov. vi. 10; xxiv. 33); מַרְפֵּא *remissio* (x. 4; comp. Prov. xiv. 30; xv. 4); עַצְלָה laziness (x. 10; comp. Prov. xix. 15); שׁוּק street (xii. 4, 5; comp. vii. 8; Cantic. iii. 2); the word play in שֵׁם and שֶׁמֶן (vii. 1; comp. Cantic. i. 3); תַּעֲנֻגוֹת delights (ii. 8; Cantic. vii. 7; Prov. xix. 10). Compare Hävernick, Introduction to O. T., I., p. 233; Ewald, Poets of O. T., II., 268 f. The Hebrew is here so strongly permeated with the Aramaic, that there are not only many individual words entirely Aramaic, but the foreign influence extends into the smallest veins, while at the same time the material remaining from the old language has been farther developed under Aramaic influence. Indeed this book deviates farther than any other in the O. T. from the ancient Hebrew, so that one is easily tempted to believe that it was the latest of them all. But this would be a hasty and erroneous conclusion, for the Aramaic penetrates not suddenly and violently, but by degrees; so that in this period of intermingling, the one writer might adopt a much stronger Aramaic tint than the other. We see from this, and from many idioms here ventured on for the first time, and wholly absent elsewhere (*e. g.*, "under the sun," *i. e.*, on the earth) only so much, that this book comes from an author from whom we have nothing else in the O. T.; to all appearances he lived not even in Jerusalem, but in some country of Palestine; for we can safely enough thus conclude from the proverbial phrase, "To go to the city," *i. e.*, Jerusalem, x. 15, compared with similar expressions, vii. 19; viii. 10 (בָּעִיר in the city), and on the contrary מְדִינָה v. 7, or שָׂדֶה v. 8, the field (or soil).—Whether this conclusion, as well as that one for the same reason based on the expression "King in Jerusalem," i. 1, is so perfectly well assured, might well be doubted; comp. for the phrase בָּעִיר also Song of Solomon, iii. 2, 3; v. 7; Deut. xxviii. 3; and also the exegetical explanations to x. 15. What Ewald (p. 269, note 1) adduces concerning the linguistic probabilities in favor of Galilee as the residence of the author, is in any case insufficient.

OBSERVATION 3.

Hävernick, Keil, Hengstenberg, *etc.*, accord with our above transfer of the epoch of the composition of Ecclesiastes into the second-third of the Persian period, or into the times of Nehemiah and Malachi (450–400). Rosenmüller, de Wette, Knobel, Ewald, Vaihinger,

Digitized by Google

ELSTER, BLEEK, *et al.* go a little farther down; they think it could not have originated until the last years of the Persian rule, or perhaps (so at least the first three) even not until the beginning of the Macedonian period. As reasons for this view they say (ELSTER, p. 7 f.; VAIH. p. 51 ff.): 1) the period of Nehemiah, and indeed also the next following decades, (mainly therefore the years 460 till 360), could not be brought into consideration, they being the happiest periods of Israel during the Persian rule; the origin of KOHELETH must occur in a time of greater national adversity and sorrow, such as did not begin till after Artaxerxes II. (Mnemon); 2) the complaint about the making of many books (xii. 12), points to a period "in which a diffuse and unfruitful literature has been formed by a peculiar learning of the schools," (ELSTER and EWALD); 3) the commencement of sectarianism which did not appear until after the peaceful period of Artaxerxes II. (404–358), forms the historical inducement to many of the expressions in the book, as iv. 17; v. 6; vii. 2–6; ix. 2, (VAIH.); 4) in the same way the book presupposes the entire disappearance of prophetic literature, and must therefore have been written a considerable period after Malachi; 5) the author points on the one hand to the occasional desire of apostacy from the Persian Kings (viii. 2), on the other, he foresees the fall of the Persian realm, and admonishes them to wait for the fitting time, adding a warning against precipitate action (viii. 5; x. 8–11, 18, 20); these are all references to the last decades of the Persian period, or to the years 360–340, as the probable era of the origin of the book (VAIH.). HENGSTENBERG has answered the first of these arguments in a thorough manner, and has shown that nothing very definite is known of a more oppressive and violent character of the Persian rule during its last period, but that this from the beginning to the end was severe and tyrannical for the Jews, and that especially under Nehemiah there was much cause for complaint, deep mourning, and despair, as may be clearly enough seen from Neh. v. 15, 18; viii. 9; ix. 36, 37; xiii. 10, 11, 15 ff. Against the second argument, taken from KOH. xii. 12, we would refer to what has already been said (§ 3, Obs.) on the reference of the expression "making many books" not only to the Jewish, but also to the entire oriental as well as the Grecian literature; whereby this argument is lost for a later period of composition. No. 3, includes the wholly untenable assumption that the germs of the "sects" of the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes were not known before the year 400 before Christ; a view so much the more groundless, the more distinctly the germs to these peculiar religious and moral tendencies may be traced back to a considerably earlier period; as for instance in the second part of the prophet Isaiah, Sadducean unbelief and materialism (chap. lvii. 3 ff.; lix. 1, ff.), and Pharisaic justification by works, and hypocrisy are deprecated, and the same may be shown in Jeremiah (comp. REUSS, *History of Christian Theology in the Apostolic Age*, I. p. 126 ss.). Though it may be a fact that according to the many quoted passages iv. 17; v. 6; vii. 2–6, *etc.*, in KOHELETH, there appear, in the germ, the scepticism of the Sadducees, the anxiety and timidity of the Pharisees, the pleasure in morose retirement of the Essenes (EWALD, *Hist. of Israel*, IV. 495); nevertheless, from this fact but the one probability for determining the period of this book is to be deduced, and that is that it belongs to the time of the exile, or to one subsequent; any thing more definite cannot be deduced from it. Comp. also the exegetical illustrations to the passages quoted, and to ix. 2.—The fourth of the above arguments is based on the erroneous supposition that the labors of the prophets were unknown to the author and distant from him, and that with him appeared a new mode of understanding the divine truth of revelation, beside which a prophetic literature could not well be imagined (ELSTER). To which we reply that there is nowhere in this book so decided an ignoring of the presence of the prophets as that contained in Macc. xiv. 41, and that the author did not find sufficient inducement to refer to the labors of the few bearers of prophetic truth whom he and his contemporaries may perhaps have known,—men like Zachariah, Haggai, and Malachi—any more distinctly than he had already done in speaking of wisdom and wise men. As to the fifth reason for the composition of the book in the last decades of the Persian rule, it rests on exegetical supports entirely too insecure to permit us to attach any weight to it. The desire of apostacy from the Persian king, or the wavering in loyalty (VAIH.) in passage viii 2, must be artificially introduced; and that the passage in chap. x. 18, "By much slothfulness the building decayeth; and through idleness of hands the house droppeth through," is a special reference to the near approach of the

Digitized by Google

ruin of the Persian kingdom, is quite as untenable, as it is arbitrary to find in viii. 5; x. 8–11, 20, warnings against a national rebellion, or immature efforts for throwing off the Persian yoke. And in general it is advisable to refrain as much as possible from introducing political references into the book, and instead of that to devote so much greater attention to its allusions to the religious and esthetical conditions of its period. These allusions however present many strikingly close parallelisms with the book of Malachi; as whose most immediate contemporary in the whole of the Old Testament literature, KOHELETH may therefore very properly be considered. On account of this unmistakable connection with the "seal of the prophets," this book can scarcely be brought down lower than the year 400 before Christ, and the hypothesis nearest to our own, of BERNSTEIN (*Quæstiones Kohelethanæ*) and of DELITZSCH (*Commentary on Job*, p. 15) must therefore be rejected, according to which it originated under Artaxerxes II. therefore between 400 and 360, B. C. Still more decidedly must we reject the views of BERGST, BERTHOLD, SCHMIDT, *et al.*, which accept the period between Alexander the Great and Antiochus Epiphanes, those of ZIRKEL and HARTMANN which adopt the epoch of MACCABEAN struggles for liberty, as well as those of HITZIG, who takes the precise year 204 B. C. as the period of the composition. The arguments presented by the latter for this exact period, are mostly the merest assumptions; *e. g.* the assertion that chap. viii. 2, points to the period after Ptolemy Lagi, who was the first to demand an oath of allegiance from the Jews (*Josephus*, *Archæology*, xii. 1); the opinion that chap. x. 16–19 refers to the commencement of the government of Antiochus Epiphanes, who at his father's death was only five years old; that the little city, chap. ix. 14 f. is the little marine city of Dora with its victorious resistance to King Antiochus the Great, 218 B. C.; that the amorous woman, chap. vii. 26, is Agathoklea, the concubine of Ptolemy Philopator †, xx. 3): that the former days were better than these of chap. vii. 10, point to the more happy periods for the Jews of the first three Ptolemys. How poorly the acceptance of such special references harmonizes with the otherwise general contents of the respective passages, the separate exegesis of each will show more pointedly. The affinity between the Book of Wisdom and KOHELETH, adduced by HITZIG, does not therefore prove the composition of the latter in the Alexandrine era, because the "Wisdom" is the original Greek product of a later imitator of the ancient Hebrew Chokmah-literature, but KOHELETH is an original production of this latter, and of a specific Hebrew character, whose isolated parallelisms with that apocryphal writer must arise from the use made of him by the author of it. (Comp. HAHN, in *Reuter's Repert.* 1838, Vol. XIV. p. 104, ff.)

OBSERVATION 4.

The aim of Ecclesiastes has ever been defined in very different ways. HIERONYMUS understood it almost wholly in a theoretical sense, when he made its object the teaching of the vanity of all earthly things; a view in which many modern men have followed him, as HERDER, EICHHORN, FRIEDLÄNDER, DATHE, and others. All these define its object mainly or exclusively according to chap. i. 2; xii. 8, and similar passages, whilst again PAULUS, UMBREIT, KÖSTER, EWALD, *et al.* look solely to such passages as i. 3; iii. 9; vi. 11, *etc.*, and make the aim of the book the demonstration of the nature of the highest good. The view of DESVOEUX belongs also to the theoretical comprehension of the book (§ 6): viz., that the author of it would prove the immortality of the soul, and a future reward in another world, with which undue appreciation of the religious character of the book, others substantially coincide, as M. FR. ROOS (*Footsteps of the Faith of Abraham*, p. 76), RHODE (*de vett. poetarum sapientia gnomica*, p. 223), *etc.* KAISER has given to the book an historical and didactic aim, by supposing that he finds therein an allegorical presentation of the secret history of the Davidic kings from Solomon to Zedekiah, (See § 1 and 6). DE ROUGEMENT, UMBREIT, and VATKE have, on the contrary, declared it to be a philosophical composition, with the difference, however, that the first designates its tendency as specifically religious, the second as skeptical, and the third as nihilistic. Luther makes the aim of Ecclesiastes wholly practical in his preface to the books of Solomon (ERL. Ed., Vol. LXIV. p. 37); "The second book is called Koheleth, what we call Ecclesiastes, and is a book of consolation. If indeed a man will live obediently to the teachings of the first book, (*i. e.*, Proverbs) and obey its commands, he is opposed by the devil, the world, and his own flesh, so that he becomes weary of his condition, and averse to it. As now Solomon in his first

Digitized by Google

book teaches obedience in contradistinction to mad frivolity and frowardness, so in this book he teaches us to be patient and constant in obedience against dissatisfaction and opposition, and to await our hour with peace and joy." Comp. his Latin Comment. p. 8: *Est ergo summa et scopus hujus libri, quod Solomon vult nos reddere pacatos et quietis animis, in communibus negotiis et casibus hujus vitæ, ut vivamus contenti præsentibus sine cura et cupiditate futurorum, sicut Paulus ait: "Sine cura et sollicitudine agentes,"—futurorum enim curam frustra affligere. Ibid.* p. 12: "*Est ergo* (*ut repetens dicam*) *status et consilium hujus libelli, erudire nos, ut cum gratiarum actione utamur rebus præsentibus et creaturis Dei, quæ nobis Dei benedictione largiter dantur ac donatæ sunt, sine sollicitudine futurorum, tantum ut tranquillum et quietum cor habeamus, et animum gaudii plenum, contenti scilicet verbo et opere Dei.*" Against the traditional Catholic conception of the book, as a substantially theoretical representation of the worthlessness and baseness of earthly things, Luther argues with energy: "*Nocuerunt multum hæc libro false intellecto plurimi sanctorum Patrum, qui senserunt Solomonem h. l. docere contemptum mundi, i. e., rerum creatarum et ordinatarum a Deo,*" *etc.*—The Catholic Hardouin, quite independent of Luther, has given to the book an object closely allied to his when he says: "That the best, that is the most tranquil, the most innocent and the most happy thing in this life, is to enjoy with his family in their repasts, the gain that a legitimate labor may have acquired, and to acknowledge that to be able to do so is a gift of God, which we should consequently use with thanks, not forgetting that we shall all be summoned to the judgment of God for these as for all other things." This purely practical and moral tendency of the conception of most expounders of the rationalistic school, appears debased to a meaningless simplicity; for example, in ZIRKEL, SPOHN, BERTHOLDT, SCHMIDT, GAAB (Contributions to the exegesis to the Song of Solomon, p. 48), G. L. BAUER, (*Int. to the O. T.*, p. 411) *etc.* According to them Ecclesiastes teaches "how one can enjoy a happy life and avert evils," (ZIRKEL); or also: "How a youth, who wishes to enter the great world, may demean himself sagely in many of the scenes of human life, and deferentially towards God, religion, and virtue," (SPOHN); or: "How one should accept fortune and misfortune, joy and sorrow," (BERTHOLDT); or: "How one, with all the imperfection of his destiny, may live cheerful and happy," (GAAB, BAUER), or: "How laws may be ascribed to human effort, to keep it within proper bounds, and point out the limit beyond which it may not pass," (SCHMIDT), *etc.*—The just medium between the practical and the theoretical in fixing the aim of this book, is found substantially with GREGORY OF NYSSA; he in his first homily regarding it, places its tendency in the elevation of the mind above all sensual perceptions, and above what is apparently greatest and most magnificent, to the super-sensual, and in the awakening of a strong desire for this super-sensual; and later, he declares the constant joy in good works that springs from the performance of them to be substantially identical with that elevation, to something beyond the sensual; (ἡ διηνεκὴς ἐπὶ τοῖς καλοῖς εὐφροσύνη, ἥτε ἐκ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἔργων γεννᾶται).* Just so writes Augustine, (*de Civ. Dei* XX. 3): *Totum istum librum vir sapientissimus deputavit, non utique ob aliud, nisi ut eam vitam desideremus, quæ vanitatem non habet sub hoc sole, sed veritatem sub illo, qui fecit hunc solem.* Several expounders of the period of the reformation, have more fully and concretely comprehended the object of this book in its theoretical as well as in its practical side, *e. g.*, BRENZ, who finds its benefits and excellences as follows: "*quod ad timorem et fiducian in Deum recte nos erudit ac ducit, quibus seu indicibus quibusdam ad pium creaturarum usum pertingamus;*" MELANCHTHON, who finds its principal aim in the *confirmatio sententiæ de providentia, of the doctrina de obedientia et patientia, of the asseveratio futuri judicii*, and encouragement to the duties of one's calling. DRUSIUS, according to whom, . . . "*agit hic liber de fine bonorum;—suadet autem. ut ab hac vanitate animum attollamus ad sublimia.* MERCERUS, according to whom Solomon *aperte docet presentibus pacatis et tranquillis animis frui, abjecta humani cordis irrequieta curiositate et inconstantia, quum divitiæ, honores, magistratus, uxor et ceteræ hujus seculi creaturæ bonæ sint, si illis cum gratiarum actione et Dei timore utaris, animo semper in Deum sublato nec his terrenis adicto,*" *et al.* STARKE (in his Int. § 9) finds a double aim in the author; a.) in reference

*Ἡ γὰρ τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐργασία νῦν μὲν διὰ τῆς ελπίδος εὐφραίνει τὸν τῶν καλῶν προιστάμενον ἔργων· μετὰ ταῦτα δὲ ἀπόλαυσιν τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἐλπίδων δεξαμένη ἴδιον τοῖς ἀξίοις τὴν ἐυφροσύνην προστίθησιν.

Digitized by Google

to himself, he had the intention publicly to confess and regret his foolish striving after peace of soul in vain things; b.) in reference to his readers, he desired to warn them against epicureanism, and to inculcate therefore especially these three rules: 1.) that one must despise all earthly things as vanity; 2.) that one must enjoy the present good with calmness and cheerfulness; 3.) that one thereby must fear God and serve Him. The latest exegetists are mostly in harmony in their acceptance of a practical as well as theoretical aim, (namely, all those who, in accordance with this, distinguish two main divisions of the book, one theoretical and the other practical, comp. § 2, obs. 1). On the basis of this view, HENGSTENBERG, VAIHINGER, and ELSTER have given the best development of the peculiar tendency of the book; the latter in connection with a detailed historical summary of the most important views of the earlier exegetists regarding its fundamental thoughts and aim.

§ 5. THEOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE AND CANONICAL VALUES.

On account of the apparent leaning of this book towards skeptical, fatalistic, and Epicurean teachings, it early became the object of doubts in regard to its inspired character, and of attacks on its canonical dignity. According to the Talmud, the philosophers (*i. e.* the collectors of the canon, or also the learned of the most ancient period) intended to suppress it on account of the contradictions within itself, and the apparent moral levity of its teachings; but this intention remained unexecuted in view of the fact, "that its beginning and its end are words of the law." * That the author of the "Wisdom of Solomon" belonged to these earliest critical opponents of the book, is an erroneous opinion entertained by AUGUSTI, SCHMIDT, *et al.* (partly also by KNOBEL); for the controversy supposed to be contained in chap. 2 of that work, against the doctrines of the Preacher, amounts in part simply to seeming points of contact, and it is in part directed against those lawless and immoral men who were accustomed to misuse many assertions of the Preacher for the purpose of glossing over their base conduct. With much greater certainty, however, the book found various opponents in the ancient church; as PHILASTRIUS (hær. 130) speaks of heretics who condemn the Preacher, because he at first proclaims that all is vanity, and then permits but one thing to remain, viz., that one should eat, drink, and be merry. Theodorus of Mopsuestia soon afterwards joined these opponents with the assertion, that Solomon composed Ecclesiastes only in accordance with human wisdom, and not by virtue of divine inspiration; this, together with other heresies attributed to him, was condemned at the fifth Ecumenical Council at Constantinople. At a still later period of the middle ages the Jacobite Barhebræus († 1286) ventured the assertion, that Solomon in Koheleth had defended the view of Empedocles the Pythagorean, (whom he considered a contemporary of Solomon), that there is no immortality of the soul.—The opinion of HIERONYMUS was authoritative for the middle-age theology of the Occident, viz., that Ecclesiastes taught the vanity of earthly things, and contempt of the joys of this world (comp. § 4, obs. 4.). Under the protection of this view of the book, entertained by Hugo of St. Victor, Bonaventura, Nicolaus of Lyra, *et al.*, it maintained its authority and acceptability with most of the theologians of the Reformation and the next following period. Luther, indeed, gave here and there a free and bold opinion of the book; viz., "that it has neither boots nor spurs, and rides only in socks, as he himself formerly in the cloister;" (see § 4, obs. 1); but again he recommended it with special emphasis as a "noble book

* FR. SCHABB. f. 30, b: "The philosophers wished to suppress the book of Koheleth, because it contains contradictions. Why then did they not suppress it? Because its beginning and its end are words of the law."—Comp. MIDR. KOHELETH f. 114, a: The philosophers wished to suppress the book of Koheleth because its wisdom all tends to what is written in chap. xi. 9; "Rejoice, O young man in thy youth;" (which is incompatible with Numbers xv. 39, *etc.*). But because Solomon adds: "Know, that for all these things God will bring thee unto judgment"—they declare that Solomon spake well (יפה אמר שלמה) comp. *Pesikta Rabb.* f. 33, a. *Vajikra R.* f. 161, b.; *Midr. Kohel.* f. 311, a, where we notice the bearing of certain assertions of the book to the side of the heretics (מינים) perhaps of the sadducees. *Tr. Edajoth*, c. 5; *Jadaim*, c. 3, where direct divine prompting is denied, *etc.* And finally also HIERONYMUS: "*Aiunt Hebræi quum inter cetera scripta Salomonis, quæ antiquita sunt nec in memoria duraverunt, et hic liber obliterandus videtur, eo quod vanas assereret Dei creaturas et totum putaret esse pro nihilo et cibum et potum et delicias transeuntes præferret omnibus, ex hoc uno capitulo meruisse auctoritatem, ut in divinorum voluminum numero poneretur, quod totam disputationem suam et omnem catalogum hac quasi ἀνακεφαλαιώσει coarctaverit, et dixerit finem sermonum suorum auditu esse promptissimum, nec aliquid in se habere difficile: ut scil. Deum timeamus et ejus præcepta faciamus.*"

Digitized by Google

which for good reasons was worthy of being daily read with great diligence by all men." He declared this wisdom taught therein, as higher than any under the sun, namely, "that every one should perform his duty with diligence in the fear of God, and therefore should not grieve if things do not go as he would have them, but should be satisfied and allow God to control in all things great and small; he called it a "book of consolation" for every one, and especially for princes and kings, to whom it might serve in some measure as a consolatory, didactic, and satisfying manual of "politics and economies." * All evangelical theology till near the end of the last century, agreed in their favorable judgment of the religious and moral worth, and the theological character of the book, a few quite insignificant and isolated cases excepted; as for example, those Dutch opposers of whom Clericus speaks.

The vulgar rationalism was the first to disseminate that low opinion of the book which has since been maintained in many circles, and whose practical consequence is its degradation below the better class of the Apocryphas of the O. T.; *e. g.*, below Sirach and the Book of Wisdom. On this platform HARTMANN affirms "Ecclesiastes to be the labor of a fretful Hebrew philosopher, composed in a morose mood, and exceedingly tedious at times;" SCHMIDT declares that it is not a work fully prepared for the public, but a hasty outline of the author for his own subsequent revision," (see § 3 obs.); DE WETTE: "Koheleth represents the last extreme of skepticism within the Hebrew philosophy, and this in a barbarous style, by means of which he shows himself partial and sensually prejudiced in the maxims of the cheerful enjoyment of life, and in virtue of which his system is no system, his consistency inconsistency, and his certainty uncertainty;" BRUCH: "The skepticism of this book extends to a painful, internal disorganization, and to a perfect despairing of all order and aim in human life;" finally KNOBEL says: All ethical teachings and admonishings in Koheleth, end in the convenience and enjoyment of life.

The refutation of these accusations, is contained mainly in the foregoing, *viz.*, in what has been said in § 2 about the contents and plan, and § 4 about the aim of the work. The decidedly pious and sternly moral stand-point of the author, appears above all in the closing passage, chap. 12, 13, 14, which lays down, as the sum of the whole, the advice to fear God, and keep His commandments, and also a warning against punishment in His future judgment. But this conclusion is not detached from the religious contents of what precedes, is not connected in a mere outward manner with the whole as if there existed no deeper organic connection between this closing "inspired teaching" and the preceding "philosophical discourse;" (expressions of ROUGEMENT, comp. § 2. obs. 1). But, as is clearly pointed out in paragraph 3, the conclusion forms the pinnacle projecting with organic necessity from the whole; it is the concentrated collection of the rays of higher truth penetrating and illuminating the whole work, which are designed to pour forth their glorifying light with full power only at the very end. The author has also every where in the preceding paragraphs distinctly announced that God is the Almighty from whom every thing originates, and especially every thing that is precious to men in body and soul, (ii. 26 ff.; iii. 10 ff.; v. 1; vii. 17–19; viii. 14; ix. 1–3); that this Almighty God, according to the measure of strict justice will deal out moral reward to the good and evil (iii. 17; viii. 12 ff.; xi. 9); that man, even where he does not understand the works of God, where they are and remain incomprehensible to him, may not cavil with God, but must humbly submit to the command to fear God (iii. 11–18; v. 6, 17 ff.; vii. 18; viii. 16 ff.); and that therefore also the enjoyment of temporal blessings must ever be accompanied with thanks to God, and with contentment and moderation, iii. 12 f. 22; v. 11 ff., 17 ff.; vi. 2 ff.). The conclusion draws from all only this result reduced to the shortest possible expression, and gives to it intentionally a form and shape which reminds us of the sum and quintessence of all other teachings of wisdom in the Old Testament, (comp. ver. 13 with Prov. i. 7; ix. 10; Ps. iii. 10; Sir. i. 16, 25, *etc.*). It also declares distinctly enough that the teachings of the book

* "*Hunc librum Ecclesiasten rectius nos vocaremus Politica vel Œconomica Salomonis, qui viro in politia versanti consulat in casibus tristibus et animum erudiat ac roboret ad patientiam.*" As an example of a prince who in accordance with Luther's advice, read Ecclesiastes with special pleasure, we may quote Frederic the Great. That he was in the habit of considering it a genuine "mirror of princes," is proven by the fact that he was not drawn to it simply by the skeptical character of its contents.

Digitized by Google

are testimonies of truth pertaining to the "words of the wise," which must cling closely "as goads and fastened nails" to the hearts of the people (xii. 9–11); whereby the author clearly wishes not only to rank himself as in the class of the Chokamin, but also to embody his work into the mass of sacred literature, and separate it from the massive productions of profane literature; (ver. 12). In view of this so emphatic testimony of the author himself and the manifold direct and indirect references of his book to the older writings of the canon (namely, to Proverbs and the Song of Solomon, comp. § 4, Obs. 2; to Job: chap. v. 14; vii. 28; to the Pentateuch: chap. v. 3, 4; xii. 7; and to the Psalms: vii. 6; xi. 5), we need not assume that "the antagonism between the divine perfection and the vanity of the world is represented as unreconciled, or but partially reconciled" (OEHLER), or what is the same thing, that the Preacher harmonizes the traditional belief in Jehovah, and his unbelief to a simply external agreement between the fear of God and the cheerful enjoyment of the moment," (KAHNIS). The reconciliation between faith and doubt is actually effected; the contest between a God-fearing life and an irreligiousness serving the world and the flesh, has been fought out to the decided victory of the former; and the account could only acquire the appearance of lingering in the earlier stages of this conflict, and of favoring skeptical uncertainty, looseness, and indecision, (Jas. i. 8), by purposely lingering with great minuteness over the description ot the conflict of the thoughts of the doubter, "accusing and excusing one another," in order thus to afford a most intuitive picture of the vanity, unrest, and joylessness of a consciousness detached from God and devoted solely to the impressions of worldly vanity, (§ 4, Obs. 2). It was the philosophical tendency of the author that forced him to this thorough development of the dialectics of doubting consciousness; and it was also the same religious and speculative tendency, philosophizing in the sense of the Old Testament, Chokmah doctrine, which probably induced him always to dispense with the sacred name of Jehovah where he speaks of God (in all 39 times), and ever adopt the more general designation of Elohim, usual also outside of the sphere of the positive revelation of the Old Testament. As the representative of such a philosophical standpoint and aim, the Preacher could lay no claim to being so direct an organ of divine revelation as the lawgiver, or as the prophets of God's ancient people. But he certainly considered his writings as a book fully harmonizing with divine revelation in the law and the prophets, if we consider the closing words already prominently alluded to, (xii. 9–12). And the excellent practical wisdom, full of significant references to the most precious truths of the entire word of God, and full of the richest consolation for earthly need and temptation of every kind, as the glorious book lavishes from beginning to end,—this, we say, is a well attested claim, that it belongs to the series not of the secondary, but of the primary canonical writings of the Old Testament.

OBSERVATION.

OEHLER (Prolegomena to the Theology of the O. T., p. 90) maintains that there is an externally-dualistic juxtaposition of the religious and worldly-skeptical character in this book. "The antagonism between the divine perfection and the vanity of the world, is represented as unreconciled; the latter as an inevitable experience, the former as a religious postulate. Thus the only wisdom of life lies in *resignation*, in which man profits of the nothingness of life as best he can, but therein commits all to God." With a still sharper censure of the skeptical standpoint of the author, KAHNIS (LUTH. *Dogmatics*, I., p. 309) declares: "Trite sounding words, many assertions not easily reconcilable, and only relatively true, and, to say the least, easily misunderstood expressions, show to him who reads this book with unprejudiced mind how, in ancient and in modern times, it could be read with anxious eyes. In it traditional faith and a skeptical view of the world, which sees vanity in all spheres of nature and human life, are united in a covenant between the fear of God and the cheerful enjoyment of the moment. However easy may be the historical comprehension of such a standpoint, it is difficult to justify its truth."—In reply to these reproaches, BLEEK has strikingly observed, in favor of the religious character of the book, that "it is affecting and elevating to see how the faith in God's reconciling justice is nevertheless retained amidst all doubt, and how the poet ever returns to it." (*Int. to the O. T.*, p. 644). HENGSTENBERG has replied in a manner still more definite and thorough to these cen-

Digitized by Google

sures: "It is not correct that the book presents an unreconciled contradiction between faith and knowledge, idea and experience. It certainly permits doubt to appear, as do the Psalms; this is the truth of the view which would distinguish two voices in the book; but this every where occurs only in order to conquer the doubt immediately. Nowhere stand, as in imitation of DE WETTE's theology, doubt and faith as equally authorized powers opposed to each other, but every where, when the voice of the flesh has spoken, it is confronted by the voice of the Spirit, as in Psalms xxxix.; xlii.; xliii. This meets us most strikingly in the very passage in which doubt is poured forth like a mighty stream in chap. ix. 7–10. The expression of a feeling that is skeptical and dissatisfied with life, extends only to verse 6; in verses 7–10 it is immediately conquered with the sword of faith.—It is also not correct that the author knows no higher wisdom of life than "*resignation*." It is true, he teaches that human life often presents difficult enigmas, that it is very difficult to comprehend the providences of God, and that we not seldom find ourselves committed to blind faith (chap. iii. 11; vii. 24; viii. 17; xi. 5). But who could not see that these are truths that yet have their force for those who walk in the light of the gospel? Not in vain does the Lord declare those blessed, who, seeing not, yet believe. The apostle enjoins upon us, that we walk by faith and not by sight. The clearest human eye is not clear enough to see every where the causes of divine guidance, and to penetrate the ways of God so frequently mysterious. In the epoch of the author, it was so much the more necessary to make this view prominent, since at that time so many of the clear eyes lacked that perception of sin which gives the key to the sanctuary of God, if we will there seek the solution of the enigma of earthly life. But the author has no thought of committing every thing to blind faith; it does not occur to him to yield the field of knowledge to unbelief. "Who is as the wise man?" —thus he exclaims in chap. viii. 1.—"And who knoweth the interpretation of a thing?" There is therefore for him a wisdom which leads into the essence of things, illuminates the mysterious depths of the cross, and justifies the ways of God. HENGSTENBERG has already illustrated (— p. 23 ff.) the philosophical character of Koheleth in his relation to revelation, and demonstrated the exclusive use of the more general name of God as a necessary consequence of the fact that the author did not wish to teach direct prophetic revelation, but simply sacred philosophy; (referring to a treatise by KLEINERT in the *Dorpat* Supplement to Theological Sciences 1, where also are considered similar passages in the books of Job, Nehemiah, *etc.*).—VILMAR, in the treatise quoted above, (§ 1, Obs. 3), has supplied an important aid to the justification of the book against the usual reproaches of skepticism, fatalism, and Epicureanism. He shows how the real weight of the paranetic (the hortatory) as well as the paracletic (the consolatory) powers of the author, the true fundamental thought of his practical philosophy of life, consists in the effort truly to fulfil individual earthly duty, even where there is no prospect of a rich worldly success, and the willingness cheerfully and continuously to labor without seeking reward or gain; (comp. ii. 10; iii. 22; v. 17 f.; viii. 15; xi. 6 ff.). "Success is of God alone, and we are nothing more and nothing less than God's servants." There is really for us no יִתְרוֹן not even in the kingdom of God in the New Testament. We are to look for no result; but unconcerned as to success or failure, and unaffected by the unfruitfulness of our efforts, and without being excited or spurred by the hope of any success whatever, or of results that are all far-reaching, we are to do day by day, and day after day, only that, and all that, which lies within our mandate.— It is true the temptation which befalls us on account of this failure of our efforts, by this apparent immovability and retrogression in the kingdom of God, and by apparent הֶבֶל even in divine things, if it is not early conquered, will inevitably become moroseness, dissatisfaction with life, renunciation of the world, and misanthropy; "so that one will let hands and feet go, and do nothing more," from which at last may proceed the almost unpardonable sin of ἀκήδεια (recklessness, indifference). Such an actual disdain of the gifts of God because he does not satisfy us, is (as ἀκήδεια) nothing but defiance of God. The natural and God-created strength, courage, and cheerfulness of life must therefore be preserved (this is the desire of the Preacher) in order that we may move according to God's will in the narrow circle which in the will of God still remains to us. The חֵלֶק is not alone, is not indeed in the first place, eating, drinking, and being merry,

Digitized by Google

which finally would be nothing else than *Dulce desipere in loco;* but the חֵלֶק consists in the pleasure of fatiguing labor, in the שֶׂמַח בַּעֲמָלוֹ (iii. 12, 22; v. 17, *etc.*). It is here a duty to assume the curse of the labor, and the sterility of labor, and to bear them cheerfully for the sake of God. In thus accepting and cheerfully bearing this curse, lies the only condition of its removal, yes, in no small degree the removal itself lies therein. We must especially preserve that God-created, cheerful, vital strength, and the fresh courage of youth, which may not carry the bitter experiences of advanced age into its sphere of life without destroying the divine work which it bears in itself—for such is indeed youth with its unconcerned and courageous spirit," (xi. 9; xii. 1 ff.). As a comprehensive, final judgment of the theological value and canonical dignity of the book, we may finally consider what is said by ELSTER, p. 33 f.: "The book bears not only a decidedly ethical and religious character, it forms also a material epoch in the connection of revelation, a peculiar stage of development of the Old Testament religion, an important link in the transition from the old to the new covenant, and therein is its canonicity safely grounded, so that we may say with CARPZOV. (*Int. in* V. T. II., 221): "*Divinæ et Canonicæ libri auctoritati utut testimonium perhibeat universa tum synagoga vetus tum primitiva Christi ecclesia, quæ in Protocanonicorum numero eum unanimi semper habuit consensu, fidem tamen præterea conciliant indubia divinitatis documenta ipsis textus visceribus innexa.*"

§ 6. THEOLOGICAL AND HOMILETICAL LITERATURE.

I. COMMENTARIES PREVIOUS TO THE REFORMATION:—GREGORII THAUMATURGI *Metaphrasis in Ecclesiasten Salomonis, ex. ed.* ANDR. SCHOTTII; Antwerp. 1613; also in *Opp.* GREG. NAZIANZENI *ed. Morell.*, T. I., p. 749 ss. (Paris, 1630). GREGORY of NYSSA, Ἀκριβὴς εἰς τὸν Ἐκκλησιαστὴν ἐξήγησις, (in eight Homilies): *Opp.* T. I., p. 373 ss. ed. Paris, 1615.—HIERONYMUS, *Commentarius in Ecclesiasten*, Opp. T. III., p. 383 ss. ed. Vallars., Venet., 1766.—OLYMPIODORUS, *in Ecclesiast. Commentarii. Bibl. Patrum max.*, Tom. xviii. p. 490 ss. SALONIUS (sec. 5), *Expositio mystica in Ecclesiasten.* ŒKUMENIUS, *Catena in Ecclesiast.* Veron, 1532. — HONORIUS of AUTUN (*Augustodunensis*), *Expositio in Ecclesiasten Salom.* BONAVENTURA, *Expositio in librum Ecclesiastes. Opp.* T. I., p. 294 ss. ed. Moguntin. 1609.

II. MODERN COMMENTARIES SINCE THE REFORMATION:—a.) Jewish Expositors: DAVID of POMI, 1571; SAMUEL ARIPOL, 1591; BARUCH BEN BARUCH (double Commentary, grammatical and allegorical). Venice, 1599; MOSES ALSCHECH, 1605; SAMUEL KOHEN of PISA, 1661; MOSES MENDELSOHN (*The Preacher Solomon*, by the author of the *Phädon* pub. by RABE. Anspach, 1771); DAVID FRIEDLÄNDER, 1788; MOSES HEINEMANN, 1831; B. HERZFELD, Brunswick, 1838.

b.) ROMAN CATHOLIC EXPOSITORS:—JOH. of KAMPEN (*Campensis*) *Psalmorum et Ecclesiastes paraph. interpretatio.* Paris, 1533.—JOH. MALDONATUS, *Commentarii in præcipuos Sacræ Scripturæ libros veteris Testamenti.* Par., 1643 f.—CORNELIUS A LAPIDE, *Commentarius in Ecclesiasten.* Antv. 1694; also in the collected Comment. in V. *et.* N. T., X. vol. Venet., 1730.—CORNEL JANSEN, *Commentarius in Ecclesiasten*, Antverp, 1589. JOH. DE PINEDA, *Comment. in Eccles.* Antv. 1620.—DU HAMEL, *Salomonis libri III. cum annotationibus.* Rotomagi, 1703. AUGUSTIN CALMET, *Commentaire literal sur la Bible.* Par. 1707 ss.—J. HARDOUIN, *Paraphrase de 'l Ecclesiaste avec des remarques.* Par., 1729. THADD. DERESER, The Sacred writings of the O. T., III. Parts. Frankfort, 1797—1832.—L. VAN ESSEN: *The Preacher Solomon;* a supplement in illustration of the O. T. Schaffhausen, 1856.

c.) PROTESTANT EXPOSITORS: JOH. BRENTIUS, *Ecclesiastes Salomonis cum Commentariis, per* HIOB GAST *e Germano in Lat. translatus et per auctorem, quantum ad sententiarum cognitionem satis est, restitutus.* Hagenov., 1529.—M. LUTHER, *Ecclesiastes Salomonis cum annotationibus.* Vitemb., 1532, *Opp., lat. ed. Erlang.* T. XXI. (also German by JUST. JONAS, 1533).—PH. MELANCHTHON, *Ennaratio brevis concionum libri Salomonis, cujus titulus est Ecclesiastes, Opp. ed.* Bretschneid., T. XIV.—THEODOR. BEZA, *Ecclesiastes Salomonis paraphrasi illustratus.* Genev. 1558.—JOH. MERCERUS, *Commentarii in Jobum, Proverbia, Ecclesiasten, etc.*, Ludg. Bat., 1573, 1651.—JOH. DRUSIUS, *Annotationes in Coheleth.* Amstelod, 1635.—PAUL EGARD, *Theologia practica sapientissimi regis Israelitarum, seu Salomon Ecclesiastes*, 1619.—THOM. CARTWRIGHT,

Digitized by Google

Metaphrasis et Homiliæ in libr. Salomonis, qui inscribitur Ecclesiastes. London, 1604.—HUGO GROTIUS, *Annotationes in V. Test.* Par., 1644; Basil, 1732, T. I.—JOH. COCCEIUS, *Comm. in libros Salomonis* (1658) *Opp. omn.*, VIII. Vol. Amstelod. 1675 ss.—MART. GEIER, *Commentarius in Salomonis Ecclesiasten.* Lips., 1647, 1711.—ABR. CALOV, *Biblia Testamenti veteris illustrata*, II. Vol. Francof., 1672.—SEBAST. SCHMIDT, *Commentarius in Coheleth.* Argentor. 1691, 1704.—F. YEARD, *A Paraphrase upon Ecclesiastes.* London, 1701.—J. W. ZIEROLD, the *Preacher Solomon*, translated in the spirit of the Hebrew idiom, and thoroughly explained. Leip., 1715.—CHR. WOLLE, *Rest of the Soul, i. e.*, the Preacher Solomon translated and enriched with moral annotations. Leips., 1729.—JOH. JAC. RAMBACH, *Annotationes in Eccles.*, in J. H. MICHAELIS, *Uberiores adnotationes in Hagiogr.* Hal., 1720.—JOH. CLERICUS, *Commentarius in Hagiographa.* Amstel., 1731.—CHR. FR. BAUER, The text of Ecclesiastes explained, which is a systematically connected discourse, in which is found Solomon's last wisdom and penance. Leips., 1732 —PH. CHR. ZEYSS, *Exegetical Introduction to Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Solomon.* Zullichau, 1735.—PETRUS HANSEN, *Reflections on Ecclesiastes*, Sec. ed. Lübeck, 1744.—FR. AD. LAMPE, *Commentar. in Psalmos graduales, Apocalypsin et Ecclesiasten.* Groning. 1741.—STARKE, Synopsis *bibliothecæ exegeticæ* in V. T. *etc.*, Vol. IV. Halle, 1768.—FR. CHR. OETINGER, *The truth of the Sensus Communis in the Proverbs and Ecclesiastes.* Stuttg., 1753.—JOH. DAVID MICHAELIS, *Poetical outline of the thoughts of Ecclesiastes.* Bremen and Leipsic, 1751, 1762.—A. V. DESVŒUX, *Philosophical and Critical Essay on Ecclesiastes.* London, 1760 (German by J. P. BAMBERGER; Berlin, 1764).—J. F. KLEUKER, *Solomon's Writings*, 1st part. Leipz., 1777.—J. T. JACOBI, *Ecclesiastes.* Celle, 1779.—VAN DER PALM, *Ecclesiastes philologice et critice illustratus.* Ludg. Bat., 1784.—J. CHR. DÖDERLEIN. *Solomon's Ecclesiastes and Song*, newly translated with short explanatory notes. Jena, 1784, 1792.—G. L. SPOHN, *Ecclesiastes*, newly translated from the Hebrew, with *Critical Notes.* Leips., 1785.—G. ZIRKEL, *Ecclesiastes*, a Reading book for the young, translated and explained. Würzb., 1792.—The same author, *Investigations into Ecclesiastes*, together with *Critical and Philological Observations.*—J. E. DATHE, Job, *Prov. Salomonis, Eccles., Cantic. Canticor. Lat. vers. notisque philol. et crit. illustr.* Hal., 1789.—J. C. CH. SCHMIDT, *Ecclesiastes*, or *Teachings of Koheleth.* Giessen, 1794.—H. EBERH. G. PAULUS, *Ecclesiastes*, 1790.—FRIED. SEILER, *Biblical Book of Devotion*, 6 parts. Erlangen, 1791.—J. CHR. NACHTIGAL, *Koheleth, or the Collection of the Wise men*, usually called Ecclesiastes. Halle, 1798.—F. W. C. UMBREIT, *The Soul-struggle of Koheleth the Wise King.* Goth., 1818.—The same, *Coheleth scepticus de summo bono.* Götting., 1820.—The same, *What Remains? Reflections of Solomon on the vanity of all earthly things*, translated and explained. Hamb. and Gotha., 1849.—G. PH. CH. KAISER, *Koheleth, the Collectivum of the Davidic Kings in Jerusalem*, an historical and didactic poem on the Downfall of the Jewish state, translated and enriched with historical, philological, and critical observations. Erlang, 1823.—H. W. SALTMANN, *Proverbs and Ecclesiastes*, translated from the original text. Dortmund, 1828.—C. F. C. ROSENMÜLLER, *Scholia*, in Vet. Test., P. IX., Vol. II. Leips., 1830.—F. B. KÖSTER, *The Book of Job and Ecclesiastes*, translated according to their strophical arrangement, Schleswig, 1831.—AUG. KNOBEL, *Commentary on the Book of Koheleth*, Leips., 1836.—H. EWALD, *The Poetical Books of the Old Testament*; Part IV. Gött., 1837. Second ed. under the title: *Books of the Old Testament;* Part II., 1867.—FR. DE ROUGEMENT, *Illustration of the Book of Ecclesiastes.* Neufchatel, 1844.—WOHLFARTH and FISHER, *Preacher's Bible*, Vol. IV. Neustadt on the Oder, 1841.—O. v. GERLACH, *The Old Testament according to Luther's translation, with Introduction and explanatory remarks*, Vol. III. Berlin, 1849.—F. HITZIG, *Ecclesiastes explained "in a concise exegetical Manual to the Old Testament;"* 7 numbers. Leipsic, 1847.—A. HEILIGSTEDT, *Commentarius in Ecclesiasten et Cantic. Canticorum* (in Maurer's *Commentarius grammaticus criticus*, in V. Test., Vol. IV. 2). Leips., 1848.—BURGER, *Commentarius in Ecclesiasten*, 1854.—E. ELSTER, *Comment. on Ecclesiastes.* Göttingen, 1855.—WANGEMANN, *Ecclesiastes of Solomon, according to contents and connection practically explained.* Berlin, 1856.—J. G. VAIHINGER, *Ecclesiastes and the Song of Solomon*, in accordance with the original text rythmically translated and annotated. Stuttg., 1858.—C. W. HENGSTENBERG, *Ecclesiastes, exegetically treated*, 1859.—H. A. HAHN, *Commentary on Ecclesiastes.* Leipsic, 1860.—P. KLEINERT, *Ecclesiastes;* translation, philological remarks, and explanatory discussions.

Digitized by Google

Berlin, 1864 (Gymnasial Programme).—L. YOUNG, *A Commentary on the Book of Ecclesiastes.* Philadelphia, 1865.

III. MONOGRAPHS:—HERMAN V. D. HARDT, *Schediasma de libro Coheleth*, 1716.—DINDORF, *Quomodo nomen Coheleth Salomoni tribuatur.* Leips., 1791.—BERGST, on the Plan of Koheleth, in EICHHORN's *Repertory*, Vol. X. p. 963 ff.—H. F. PFANNKUCHE, *Exercitationes in Ecclesiasten.* Götting, 1794. J. F. GAAB, *Aids to the Exegesis of the Song of Solomon, Ecclesiastes, and the Lamentations.* Tübingen, 1795.—A. TH. HARTMANN, *Linguistic Introduction to the Book of Koheleth*, in Winer's Journal, Vol. I. s. 29 ff.—R. HENZI, *Programma quo libri Ecclesiastæ argumenti brevis adumbratio continetur. Dorpat*, 1827.—R. STIER, *Hints for a faithful understanding of the Scriptures*, Königsberg, 1824.—F. LÜHRS, *Ecclesiastes*, in the Quarterly for Theology and the Church, 1847; Vol. III.—VAIHINGER, On the Plan of *Ecclesiastes, Essays, and Reviews*, 1848, H. II.—The same, Art. Ecclesiastes, in Herzog's Real Encyclopedia, Vol. XII., p. 92 ff.—UMBREIT, *Unity of the Book of Koheleth, Studien und Kritiken* 1857, H. I.—ED. BÖHL, *Dissertatio de Aramaismis libri Koheleth, qua librum Salomoni vindicare conatur.* Erlang, 1860. —A. F. C. VILMAR, *On Koheleth*, Journal for Pastoral Theology, 1863, p. 241 ff.—FR. BÖTTCHER, *New Exegetical Gleanings from the Old Test.*, Sec. 3, p. 207 ff.—J. F. K. GURLITT, *Studien und Kritiken, in illustration of Koheleth*, 1865, II., p. 321 ff. *Bernstein Quæstiones Kohelethanæ.*—GELBE, *Supplement to the Introduction to the O. T.*, p. 129 ff. Leips., 1866.

SPECIAL EXEGESIS OF THE PASSAGE Chap. xii. 1–7: CASP. SIBEL († 1658), *Frænum juventutis, seu perspicua et graphica descriptio incommodorum senectutis a Salomone*, Eccles. xii. 1–9 *tradita homiliis* 33 *explicata.* Deventer, 1639 (also in his *Opp. Theologica*, Tom. I.).—J. F. WINZER, *Commentatio de loco Kohel.* XI. 9; XII. 7; 3 *programme.* Leips., 1818, 19.—Gurlitt a. a. O., p. 331 ff.—The older literature (*e. g.*, JOHN SMITH, *Regis Salomonis descriptio senectutis;* WEDEL, *de moribus senum Salomoniacis;* SCHEUCHZER, *Physica sacra*, T. IV., p. 819 ss.; JABLONSKI, *Last Speeches of Solomon;* PRAUN, *Physico-anatomica analysis cap. XII. Ecclesiastes;* PAPE, *Weekly Sermons, etc.*) is quite fully enumerated by Starke on this passage.

[Works on Ecclesiastes not mentioned by Zöckler. A Commentary on Ecclesiastes by Moses Stuart, Prof. of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary, Andover, Massachusetts. New York, 1851.—Very full and minute, containing valuable introductions on the design and method of the book, its time and authorship, with an account and description of the ancient versions. The Book of Ecclesiastes, with Notes and Introduction, by Charles Wordsworth, D.D., Archdeacon of Westminster. London, 1868; a condensed but valuable commentary in one volume with Proverbs and the Song of Solomon. It maintains the ancient view of the date and authorship, and is very full of the patristic interpretations, whilst exhibiting a good acquaintance with the modern German Exegesis. To these add (mainly from the lists given in Horne's Introduction, and Smith's Dictionary of the Bible) a philosophical and critical essay on Ecclesiastes, with Philological Observations, by A. V. Desvœux. London, 1762, 4to., (see a notice of it in the Monthly Review, O. S., Vol. XXVI., p. 485). Ecclesiastes translated with a Paraphrase and Notes, by Stephen Guernay. Leicester, 1781, 8vo.—Ecclesiastes: A New Translation from the Original Hebrew, by Bernard Hodgson, LL.D., Principal of Hartford College, Oxford. London, 1791, 4to.—An Exposition of the Book of Ecclesiastes, by Edward Reynolds, D. D., Bishop of Norwich. Revised and corrected by the Rev. Daniel Washbourne, London, 1811, 8vo.; a work that formed part of the collection of Notes on the Bible, usually called the Assembly's Annotations. London, 1822.—An attempt to illustrate the Book of Ecclesiastes by a Paraphrase (similar to Doddridge's Family Expositor) in which the expressions of the Hebrew author are interwoven with a Commentary; accompanied by valuable Notes on the scope and design of the book.—The Synopsis Criticorum of Matthew Pole will be found a great store-house of the opinions of the Biblical scholars of the 16th and 17th centuries. Among these the Commentary of Martin Geier, barely mentioned by Zöckler, stands preëminent. It is still a most valuable guide to the meaning of the old book, and, in regard to its essential meaning, is unsurpassed by later criticisms. There may also be mentioned, here, Scott's Commentary, and especially the Commentary of Matthew Henry, as contained in his general commentary on the Bible. It makes no show of learning, though in reality the product of more erudition than is commonly claimed for

Digitized by Google

it. It shows how the deep and difficult things of Scripture are, ofttimes, better comprehended by the spiritual than the merely critical mind.—T. L].

APPENDIX BY THE AMERICAN EDITOR.

[The Antiquity and Authorship of Koheleth.—Notwithstanding the plausible arguments adduced by Zöckler, § 4, and the authorities he quotes, the antiquity and the Solomonic authorship of this book of Koheleth are not lightly to be given up. The rationalistic interest contradicts itself. At one time it is argued for the late date of the work, that it contains a recognition of a future life. This is grounded on the assumption, so freely entertained without proof, that the Jews derived their knowledge of a future life from the Persians, during and after the captivity. Another class of rationalists, for a different reason, yet with the same purpose of disparaging the book, strenuously maintain that all its teachings are confined to this world, and that there is no recognition whatever of any life or judgment beyond it. Again, the difficulty of fixing any period for its authorship, if we depart from the date of Solomon, is another proof that no other time is genuine. The reader will see how great this difficulty is by simply adverting to the different views presented by Zöckler, all of which are held with equal confidence, and yet, in every way, are opposed to each other. Once set it loose from the Solomonic time, and there is no other place where it can be securely anchored.

The internal evidence of the Solomonic authorship, when viewed by itself, or without reference to the argument from what are called later words, or Chaldaisms, is very strong. Independent of any influence from such an objection, the reader, whether learned or unlearned, could hardly fail to be struck with the harmony between the character of the book and the commonly alleged time of its composition. It is just such a series of meditations as the history of that monarch would lead us to ascribe to him in his old age, after his experience of the vanity of life in its best earthly estate, and that repentance for his misuse of God's gifts, in serving his own pleasure, which would seem most natural to his condition. The language which he uses in respect to kingly power, and the oppression of the poor, has been made an argument, by some, against the authenticity of the book as ascribed to him. To another class of readers, viewing the whole case in a different light, this very language would furnish one of the strongest arguments in its favor. Even if we do not regard him as referring directly to himself, yet his experience in this respect, greater than that of others in a lower position, may well be supposed to have given him a knowledge of the evils of despotic power, and of government in general, whether in his own dominions or in those of other monarchs, which could not so well have come from any other position. It agrees, too, with what we learn of the character of Solomon in other respects, that though fond of great works, and of a magnificent display of royal state, he was, by no means, a tyrant, but of a mild and compassionate disposition towards his own subjects, and all whom he might regard as the victims of oppression; hence his studious love of peace, and the general prosperity of his reign, which the Jews regarded as their golden age.

In regard, too, to its literary claims, its ornate style and diction, and other excellencies of composition usually conceded to it, which period, it may well be asked, is to be regarded as best adapted to such a work,—that splendid era of national prosperity, such as in other historical periods has ever been found most favorable to literary effort, the time when Solomon wrote his three thousand parables, his poems one thousand and five, and his discourses on Natural History, from the cedar on Lebanon to the hyssop growing out of the wall, containing also a treasure of knowledge concerning domestic animals, birds, reptiles, and fishes—such an era, we say, of national splendor, and consequent intellectual life, or that time of darkness, retrogradation, obscurity, and semi-barbarism, contemporaneous with and following the captivity, that historical twilight and confusion, in which almost any thing may be found, or invented, by those who would throw discredit on the received Scriptures? If Koheleth is to be assigned to a later date, the Book of Kings, it would seem, must go still later; for nothing, so far as the thought is concerned, would be in better harmony with the account there given of Solomon's splendid reign and the sorrows of his old age, than this production wherein both are so graphically portrayed, and set forth as a lesson of warning. The most stubborn rationalist must admit the historical account, we have, to have been founded, at least, on credible tradition. Every thing goes to show

Digitized by Google

that Solomon was distinguished for literary as well as imperial eminence. Some of the books he wrote retained their hold upon the national memory long after the greater part had been lost by failure of transcription, or a diminution of interest, or obsoleteness arising from any other causes. We can account for the minor portion that remained. The sacred mystic song was written in Solomon's pure youth, when his name was Jedediah, the *beloved* of Jehovah, whose voice, in the visions of the night, he had heard responding to his earnest cry for wisdom. Its preservation was, doubtless, owing, in a great degree, to the very aspect of mystery which it presented from the beginning. It was early seen that it could have no consistent meaning given to it as an ordinary epithalamium, or even as a picture of the better human conjugal life. Its rapt, ecstatic, dream-like, transitions, its most sudden and inexplicable changes of scene, the strange purity of its language, even when it seemed to be the vehicle of the most ardent love, would bear no Anacreontic or Sapphic interpretation. Its ethereal chasteness, repelled, as it ever has repelled, all approaches of sensual feeling.* Hence very early must have arisen the thought of its containing that idea of a Divine bridal relation which was so precious to the pious in Israel, as the chosen people, the "beloved of God." This gives us the reason why a production so strange, so unearthly, we may say, was preserved from becoming obsolete like the rest of Solomon's numerous songs. It accounts, too, for the tenacity with which, against the strongest objections seemingly, it ever kept its place among the Scriptures deemed canonical or inspired,—being thus ever regarded in the Jewish Church, even until the bridegroom came. A similar argument may be maintained in respect to the Proverbs. Out of the "three thousand" mentioned, 1 Kings v. 12, less than a third of that number entered into the national ethics, and were arranged, in the days of Hezekiah (see Prov. xxv. 1), in the form in which we now have them. All this favors the idea that out of Solomon's numerous writings, or, rather, *utterances*, as they are called, 1 Kings v. 12 [וַיְדַבֵּר שְׁלֹשֶׁת אֲלָפִים מָשָׁל], there was, also, preserved this precious discourse on life's vanity, this series of meditations so addressing themselves to the universal human heart, and especially to the Jews as reminding them, by contrast, of the period of their highest national greatness. Thus viewed, it is more easy to account for the preservation of Koheleth than for that of any other book in the canon except the Psalms and the Pentateuch. There may be allowed the idea of a later editor, or recensor, who may have added some of the short prose scholia by way of explanation, even as they were added to the Pentateuch —some few parenthetical insertions of the name Koheleth where it was deemed necessary more clearly to announce the speaker, and perhaps some comparative modernizations of the language, or the adaptation of it to a later period. But the book itself, in its plan, its ideas, its great lesson, belongs to the Solomonic time beyond all others, as is shown by intrinsic evidence, by the extreme difficulty which the opponents of its antiquity find in adapting it to any other period, and the endless disputes and contradictions in which they mutually involve themselves in the effort.

* It has been said that this portion of Scripture has a tendency to stir up licentious passions; and even most pious men, like WORDSWORTH and MATTHEW HENRY, have felt themselves called upon to give a caution against reading it in a wrong spirit, lest it have this dangerous result. But it may well be a question, whether any such caution is really needed, or whether such an effect was ever produced in the thorough sensualist. In his ignorance, he might try the experiment, but we may well doubt whether such a one ever read a single chapter without getting wearied and discouraged in the unholy attempt. He can make nothing of it. There is something here too pure—too dreamy and unintelligible, he would say—to kindle a licentious flame. There pervades it a holy, spiritual, unearthly air, which chills every effort to treat it as a mere love song. This is confirmed by the fact that no such attempted abuse of it is to be found, or rarely found, in the licentious literature of any, even an infidel, age. When, or where, was ever love song so written? When, in any composition of the kind, was there ever such a combination of power and brightness, or so much of an indescribable awe mingling with its serene beauty? When was the object of affection ever thus described: "Who is she that looketh forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners?" It is the spotless Church, the Bride of the Lamb, arrayed in the white and glorious apparel that He has given her. "Arise, my love, my fair one, arise and come away." It is the Bridegroom's resurrection voice, calling to the Beloved who lies sleeping "in the clefts of the rocks" (see the frequent allusions to this in the Syriac liturgical hymns, and compare Isaiah xxvi. 19: "Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust"). *Surge formosa mea*, "arise, my sister, bride [יוֹנָתִי—רַעְיָתִי—כַּלָּתִי—אֲחוֹתִי] my love, my dove, my perfect one, arise and come away." For lo, the morning breaks, "the shadows flee"—death's "winter night is past, the rain is over and gone, the flowers (of Paradise) again appear, the voice of the turtle [the song of love] is heard in our land." How heavenly chaste is this language, though so tender and impassioned! How repellent of all impurity! It is some feeling of this, even in the most licentious, that makes it impossible to treat Solomon's Song of Songs like the amatory strains of MOORE, or the erotics of OVID and CATULLUS.—T. L.

Digitized by Google

In nothing is this more evident than in the attempts that have been made to explain what have been called its historical allusions, such as ch. iv. 13-16; ix. 15; xii. 12, *etc.* If they are such, they may be referred to events preceding, or cotemporaneous with, the time of Solomon, with as much clearness, or with as little difficulty, it may rather be said, as to any times following. But these critics will have them to be much later. It is essential to their argument; but it is wonderful to see how, in fixing them, they continually unsettle previous views just as confidently held, and directly contradict each other. HITZIG goes down to the time of Ptolemy Euergetes, king of Egypt about 230 B. C., and finds "the old and foolish *king*" (iv. 13) in the High *Priest* Onias (no difficulty in making a king out of a priest), and the wise young man in his nephew Joseph, who wrested his kingdom (his priesthood) from him, *etc.* *Ergo,* Koheleth was written after this. Another critic refutes HITZIG, as he might easily do, and then he himself is refuted by a third, and so they go on, in respect to this and similar plans, refuting one another, until there is nothing left of them, whilst the old book and the old account of it stand in their historical integrity, unaffected by any such self-destroying criticism. The "old and foolish king" has been referred to Rehoboam (see WORDSWORTH and others of the more orthodox commentators), but there is equal, if not greater difficulty in that. Better take it as a general illustration, of which history furnishes frequent examples, such as Solomon would easily have known from his royal experience, or have presented by the aid of his imagination, as something which would not fail to find its confirmation, in some form, in the annals of almost every people. The "old and foolish king," born to royalty, בְּמַלְכוּתוֹ נוֹלָד, and the ambitious young man, coming out of obscurity and restraint, מִבֵּית הָסוּרִים, who rises to great power, either becoming king himself, or, what is better, sometimes, Mayor of the Palace, with an "impoverished" (רָשׁ) and humbled king under him, are quite common characters in history. It needs no hunting among the dark times of the later Jewish history, or the assigning any prophetic spirit to Solomon, making him to see what a fool Rehoboam would be when he came to the throne, to find cases in abundance, either for the most ancient or the most modern times. And so of what follows, about the "second child standing up in his stead," it is quite a serious question whether they have not made a particular historical allusion out of a general and most affecting picture of the flowing generations: I saw *all the living* (all the human race as presented to his imagination) walking (passing on, sub sole) *beneath the sun,* and the second child, the second generation (as the offspring of the one before), that shall stand in its place. How exactly does this harmonize with what follows: there is no end to all the people, *to the all* (literally) that was before; yea, those who come after have no joy in it [בוֹ in the singular as referring to the collected *all* (כֹּל) that is past]. It is highly poetical this treating all the long past as one antecedent, dead and gone, of no account in comparison with the boasting self-satisfied present. It certainly seems out of place to make any application of this graphic language ["all the living"—"people without end"] to Jeroboam, or to the man whom HITZIG has dug out of obscurity, or to any of the later events of Jewish history. See more fully on this and the preceding verse the exegetical appended note, p. 84. The same may be said of "the poor wise man (ix. 15) who saves the city." It has been again and again repeated in history. Solomon must have known enough to warrant the illustration without having in view any circumstantial event that has come down to us. Again, the "many books," of ch. xii. 12, has furnished a most fruitful subject of dispute about the period to which it best applies, and by which these critics would determine the date of Koheleth. If סְפָרִים here means books at all, in the modern sense of separate treatises on various subjects, it may have a very fair application to the many writings which the account, 1 Kings v. 12, 13, ascribes to Solomon himself; but there is another view of the matter which may be fairly taken. Instead of referring to Persian, Greek, or Babylonian literature, to Ptolemaic collections, or Alexandrian libraries, the language may be used simply of this little book, or collection, styled Koheleth. It may well be doubted whether סְפָרִים here means *books* at all, in the large plural sense of separate treatises on every variety of subject, or collections of volumes, according to the idea of the critics referred to. The word סֵפֶר seems to be

Digitized by Google

sometimes used for a book in this separate sense, as "the Book of the Covenant" (סֵפֶר הַבְּרִית), Exod. xxiv. 7; 2 Kings xxiii. 2; The Book of the Law (סֵפֶר הַתּוֹרָה) Josh. i. 8, or the Book of Life, Ps. lxix. 29, but in these cases it may more strictly be regarded as meaning an account, roll, catalogue, or writing in general, long or short, either as a whole, or a part. Thus in Job xxxi. 55: "O that mine enemy had written a book,"—that is, his accusing declaration, or bill of indictment. And so it is used of a bill of divorce, Deut. xxiv. 1, 3. In 2 Samuel xi. 14 it means a letter, the very curt epistle that was sent by David to Joab about Uriah; so in 2 Kings x. 1. Again, the plural may be used, like the corresponding Greek and Latin phrases, to denote a writing collectively, or as a collection of words and sentences—πολλὰ γράμματα, *multæ literæ*—much writing, or many sentences, though referring to single treatises, as Xen. Mem. IV. 2, 1. In this collective way, the plural form, in Greek, may be used to denote a single law or precept, as Aristoph. *Ecclesias.* 1047, γραμμάτων εἰρηκότων. Or lastly, and most probably, it is used in the plural like the Latin *libri*, and the Greek βίβλοι, for the different parts or sections of the same work, as Cicero says in his *treatise De Divinatione*, II., 1, 3, *tres libri perfecti sunt de Natura Deorum*. So in the Greek, βίβλοι was early used of the different parts of one work, as in the suppliants of Æschylus, 944, ἐν πτυχαῖς βίβλων κατεσφραγισμένα, does not mean in separate books, as we take the term, but in the compartments of one and the same book. There is every thing to favor the idea that it is so used by Koheleth. The whole aspect of the passage, too, aside from any exegesis of the single word ספרים, shows that the writer had in his mind only this single brief discourse, or meditation, or collection of thoughts, which he is just bringing to a close: "There is only one thing remains to be said" (וְיֹתֵר מֵהֵמָּה, τὸ λοιπόν, ver. 12): "Of making many chapters (as we have rendered it in the Metrical Version), sections, cantos, or books, there is no end." Or, to make a great book of it, there is no *need* (as קֵץ, like the Latin *finis*, the Greek τέλος, and the synonymous Hebrew עֵקֶב will well bear to be rendered). Or, "there is no end" to such a train of reflections, if we choose to carry it on.* But enough has been said; "hear then the conclusion of the whole matter." If this be a right view, then all that learning and argumentation to which Zöckler refers go for nothing. Along with it, becomes wholly irrelevant the dispute in respect to the literary era to which it is supposed to refer, whether the Solomonic, the Persian, or the Ptolemaic.

The most plausible arguments against the Solomonic authorship have been derived from certain words, which have been assigned (many of them on the slightest grounds) to a later time. There is, without doubt, something peculiar in the style of this book, but whether it is owing to the peculiar nature of the subject requiring a different phraseology, or to its meditative philosophical aspect demanding abstract terms with varieties of form or termination not elsewhere required, or to the royal position of the writer, giving him a more familiar acquaintance with certain words really foreign, or seemingly such [because not ordinarily used, or because they belong to a courtly dialect], or to all of these causes combined, it may all be reconciled with the idea of its true and Solomonic authenticity. Wordsworth has given a condensed but very thorough treatment of this question in the Introduction to his valuable Commentary, together with a close examination of all the words of this kind cited by Zöckler. It is derived from L. V. Essen, *der Prediger Salomo*, p. 42–45, where they are all taken up as they are objected to by Knobel and others. To this is added some admirable reasoning by Dr. Pusey, with a reference to a similar refutation by Wangemann. He gives, also, what to some would seem to be of still more value, if we consider their source, namely, from Herzfeld, himself a rationalist, refuting the philological views, in respect to these words, of other rationalists, and thus showing that, in regard to most of them, these critics have so differed as to refute one another.

*[The true grammatical construction is to take אֵין קֵץ, not as the predicate, but as qualifying ספרים, books, or, a book, without end,—to make a never ending book, or to go on in this way *ad infinitum*. It is the Hebrew mode of expressing such negation—comp. אֵין מִסְפָּר, *innumerable*, Joel i. 6, *et al.* So לא is used, and sometimes אַל, as in Prov. xxx. 31 and Prov. xii. 28, אַל־מָוֶת, like a compound word—*no death*—Gr. ἀ-θανασία—Lat. *im-mortalitas*. An endless book; of course taken hyperbolically, as a mode of expressing the inutility of a prolonged discourse.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

A great part of these words the present editor of ZÖCKLER has examined in exegetical notes appended to the translation; but there are two or three of so much importance, and so much insisted upon by the deniers of the Solomonic authenticity, that he has deemed them worthy of especial attention in this place. Great stress has been laid upon such words as פִּתְגָם פַּרְדֵּס and מְדִינָה as proving the late date of Koheleth. The only proof is that they are found, besides their use here, in Ezra, Esther, Daniel, and Nehemiah. But certainly it cannot be pretended that the words themselves are of this late date, or that they were not known very widely, and at a much earlier time, and in such a way that the knowledge of them by a person in the condition of Solomon would be not only possible, but highly probable. In fact, these words, although, philologically, they may be assigned to some particular speech, rather than to others, belong, in use, to all the principal Oriental tongues allied to, or territorially near, the Hebrew. פַּרְדֵּס. paradise, for example, may properly be called Persian, as the thing denoted, a magnificent garden, was more peculiarly Persian; but the word may be Shemitic too [פרד, to *divide, cut off in portions*, lay out, or with another sense, like the Arabic فرد denoting something *rare* and *costly* as being separate], with a foreign termination. Though rendered garden, it denotes something more magnificent than the common Hebrew גַּן. It is found in the Greek of XENOPHON, Παράδεισος, but used in such a familiar way as to show that it was very early imported into the language from the East, like other names of a similar kind. There is every probability that it had come in at the earliest intercourse, peaceful or warlike, between the Greeks and Persians, or the Greeks and Babylonians. Why, in making this transition to the remoter West, may it not have stopped, at a still earlier day, at the courts of David or Solomon, and been employed, in their courtly dialect, for things to which the more ordinary vernacular was not so well adapted? Certainly it was the very term wanted here (chap. ii. 5, גַּנּוֹת וּפַרְדֵּסִים *gardens* and *parks*) to express the higher luxury, and no other word, in the whole range of Eastern tongues, as they then were, could have been so well adapted to it. Splendid gardens, or parks, were more common among the Persians and Babylonians; but even should we grant that the word is wholly foreign, there is nothing strange in the idea of its being well known to Solomon, without our supposing that he intimately understood or could speak those foreign tongues. The word was certainly in the Chaldaic as well as in the Persian, and the former tongue must have differed less from the Hebrew in the days of David and Solomon, than in those of Ezra. As a term of luxury, its transference to the courtly or loftier language of another neighboring kingdom is just what might be expected. This justifies us in saying that its use by Solomon appears more natural than would have been its employment by an ordinary Hebrew writer of the later time of Malachi. The great king of Israel was the literary superior among the neighboring contemporary monarchs, and his knowledge of other royal terms and ideas was enough to warrant him in calling his own pleasure grounds by a foreign name that had been widely appropriated to such a purpose. Such a transference, in respect to things of luxury and magnificence, belongs to modern as well as to ancient times. The names of things rare or precious, such as gems, costly fabrics imported from abroad, or other things peculiar to certain lands, are retained in their native form, and easily pass into other languages. There is the term קִנָּמוֹן (cinnamon) which we find Exod. xxx. 23; Prov. vii. 17. It must have come into Hebrew as early as the thing itself was known, which was doubtless coeval with the earliest Phœnician or Egyptian traffic. It came from the far East, yet how unchangeable its form (in this respect like the word paradise) even to the present day. So in 1 Kings x. 11, 22, we have the names of rare commodities brought by the ships of Solomon and the Phœnician king from the far land of Ophir. They have strange names, שֶׁנְהַבִּים (*shenhabbim*), קוֹפִים (*kophim*), תֻּכִּיִּים (*tukkiyyim*), and are rendered in various ways—in our version, *ivory*, *apes*, and *peacocks*. They kept these names in Hebrew, for there were no others to be used. Now had it so happened that there had been occasion to speak of them by a late writer, like Ezra, or the author of the book of Esther, it would have been said that Kings too was a book of the later Hebrew (*Sequioris Hebraismi*).

Digitized by Google

The argument is an absurd one, though carried sometimes to an extravagant length. It is all the more inconclusive, this manner of determining the date of books, when there is taken into view the scanty literature to which it is so confidently applied.

A similar method of reasoning is applicable to the word פִּתְגָם which is found ch. viii. 11. This word is Persian—that is, there is something like it in use in that language, though its derivation, as a native term, is by no means clear. It appears to have been still more ancient in the Aramaic, where it is used (especially in the Syriac branch) very frequently, and with such familiarity that we can hardly help regarding it as vernacular. It is not at all treated as a foreign term. The Syriac פִּתְגָם or, in the emphatic form, פִּתְגָמָא is as common as the Hebrew דבר. It is used, however, in a higher sense, to denote *edict*, royal or *judicial* sentence. When the Babylonian or Assyrian was the greater power, it was more likely to have come from the Aramaic into the Persian, than the contrary way. How much more likely, then, its still earlier passage into the near Shemitic branch of the Hebrew, even as a word generally understood, and more especially as a courtly or *legal* term, such as it has ever been the way to introduce from foreign, though not remote, languages. Among all nations what is callod their law language, and, in a more general sense, their technical language, is more or less of this kind. We go for our law terms to the Latin and the Norman French; the Latins had many words of this kind from the Greek. There seems a necessity for such a course in the case of things or ideas demanding peculiar exactness in their expression, because of the generality and indefiniteness which the attrition of very common use brings into words from native roots, though originally as clear as any that are thus received. There is, therefore, the same reason for the transference of such a word as פִּתְגָם, as has been given in the case of פַּרְדֵּס. It is a courtly term, and has, moreover, a judicial sense, which the most ordinary national intercourse would bring into notice. There was, besides, the extensive dealing of Solomon with the nations around, excelling in this respect any of the kings of Israel before or after him. This extended to Egypt, to Syria, to the remote Southern Arabians, or Ethiopians, and, doubtless, to Persia and lands still farther east. His ships went to Ophir, and his intimacy with the Phœnicians put him in possession of much of that wide knowledge which they possessed beyond all other peoples. See this fully stated 1 Kings v. vi. ix. and x. Such an intercourse must have not only increased his own vocabulary, but brought many new words into the common Hebrew language. In view of this, the wonder ceases that a few such words should be found in the Solomonic writings. It is in fact a proof, rather than a disproof, of authenticity. However surprised we might be to find such words in Amos, or even in the later Malachi, they appear perfectly natural in the learned and kingly Solomon, as they do also in the later writings of the courtly Daniel and Ezra, who, with all their foreign intercourse, were not perhaps equal in political and statistical knowledge to the ancient monarch. Their dialect marks their position rather than their time. And this is confirmed by what is well said by LUDWIG EWALD (*Salomo, Versuch*, p. 429): "Solomon had such a variety of knowledge and intercourse with foreigners, by his extensive commerce and dominions, and by his relations with strange women, that his style, especially in old age, must have been influenced thereby. With his paradise-like parks the word paradise came into the Hebrew language" (see WORDSWORTH, *Int.*, p. 3, note).

The word פִּתְגָם, therefore, so much used in all the East, would be known to him from kingly and ambassadorial intercourse, in which juridical and diplomatic language especially occurs, and he would be more likely to use it in the ornate style of Ecclesiastes, than an ordinary term of less state and magnificence. Besides, it admirably suits the passage in which it is found in conveying an idea for which the common Hebrew מִשְׁפָּט would have been hardly adequate. It is intended to be in the most precise style of forensic diction: "Because sentence against an evil work is not speedily executed," *etc.* It is the figure of an *edict* issued from the royal chancery, but suspended over the head of the threatened subject—an "arrest of judgment," as we say in our law language. It was a term probably much used in such a style of proceedings, though not common in the vulgar speech.

Digitized by Google

One more example of this kind may be given here. The word מְדִינָה as used ii. 8, and especially ver. 7 ("when thou seest injustice in a *province*," *etc.*), is cited as evidence of cotemporaneity with Esther, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Daniel, where the great Persian satrapies are expressed by the term. [It occurs, however, Lam. i. 1 and Ezek. xix. 8.] But besides the argument that no personator of Solomon, of ordinary intelligence, would subject himself to the charge of such a glaring anachronism, there is the strongest etymological proof to the contrary. There is no word in the Old Testament more purely Hebrew in *form*, as well as in *derivation*. מְדִינָה means literally *place of judgment*. Now Solomon gave great attention to the administration of justice. He had the land divided into administrative departments, as we learn from 1 Kings iv. 7, *etc.*, and these, as appears from other places, and the practices of later kings, were also *judicial circuits*. Had a word for such a province not existed in the language before, this is just the one that must have been formed for that purpose from a root denoting judgment, and the usual prefix מ denoting place. The oppression mentioned is just that which would be likely to occur in the departments of Israel as described 1 Kings iv. 7 with the names of the governors or satraps there named, and such cases of wrong may have often come up before the higher chancery of the king, who, with all his fondness for power and magnificence, is represented to us as a great lover of justice, and noted for the equity of his decisions. If, afterwards, the same word, or one formed on the same model, came to be used by the Babylonians and Persians, it was because no one was better adapted to express the idea of provinces whose governors or judges represented the ultimate sovereignty. The word in the later language came from the older, to which, in its etymological purity, it so strictly belongs.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

ECCLESIASTES.

TITLE:

WORDS OF THE PREACHER, SON OF DAVID, KING IN JERUSALEM.

FIRST DISCOURSE.

Of the vanity of the practical and the theoretical wisdom of men.

CHAPTERS 1, 2.

A. The theoretical wisdom of men, directed to a knowledge of the things of this world, is vanity.

2 Vanity of vanities, saith the preacher, vanity of vanities; all *is* vanity.
3 What profit hath a man of all his labour which he taketh under the sun?
4 *One* generation passeth away, and *another* generation cometh: but the earth abideth
5 for ever. The sun also ariseth, and the sun goeth down, and hasteth to his place
6 where he arose. The wind goeth towards the south, and turneth about unto the
7 north; it whirleth about continually, and the wind returneth again according to his
circuits. All the rivers run into the sea; yet the sea *is* not full, unto the place
8 from whence the rivers come, thither they return again. All things *are* full of la-
bour; man cannot utter *it:* the eye is not satisfied with seeing, nor the ear filled
9 with hearing. The thing that hath been, it *is that* which shall be; and that which
is done *is* that which shall be done: and *there is* no new *thing* under the sun.
10 Is there *any* thing whereof it may be said, See, this *is* new? it hath been already of
11 old time, which was before us. *There is* no remembrance of former things; neither
shall there be *any* remembrance of *things* that are to come with *those* that shall
12, 13 come after. I the preacher was king over Israel in Jerusalem. And I gave
my heart to seek and search out by wisdom concerning all *things* that are done
under heaven; this sore travail hath God given to the sons of man to be exercised
14 therewith. I have seen all the works that are done under the sun; and behold, all
15 *is* vanity and vexation of spirit. *That which is* crooked cannot be made straight;
16 and that which is wanting cannot be numbered. I communed with mine own heart,
saying, Lo, I am come to great estate, and have gotten more wisdom than all *they*
that have been before me in Jerusalem: yea, my heart had great experience of
17 wisdom and knowledge. And I gave my heart to know wisdom, and to know mad-
18 ness and folly: I perceived that this also is vexation of spirit. For in much wisdom
is much grief: and he that increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow.

[Ver. 4.—לְעוֹלָם. See the extended discussion on this and kindred words, p. 44 T. L.]

[Ver. 5.—זָרַח: Primary sense, *irradiation*, *scattering*, like זרח, and זרע, *to sow—scatters its rays—spargit lucem*. Part. *beaming*, *glowing*. See Metrical version. Compare Virgil, frequent, *aurora spargebat lumine terras*. שׁוֹאֵף Zöckler would give it here the sense of *running*, *going swift*. It is better to preserve the primary sense of *panting*. It suits better the hidden metaphor, on which see note, p. 38 T. L.]

[Ver. 8.—הַדְּבָרִים. Rendered *things* in E. G. So the Vulgate, *cunctæ res*. Best rendering is the more common and

Digitized by Google

primary one of *words:* all words weary in expressing the vanity. Zöckler objects to this as making a tautology with לְדַבֵּר, following. The argument is the other way; such seeming tautologies or verbal parallelisms are rather regarded by the Hebrews as an excellency of diction.—T. L.]

[Ver. 10.—לְעֹלָמִים. See extended note, p. 44.—T. L.]

[Ver. 14.—רְעוּת. There is no need of resorting to the Chaldaic for this word; neither has it any connection with רָצָה. It comes easily from the very common Hebrew רָעָה, primary sense, to *feed* (transitively or intransitively), *pasture* (not a verb of eating, like אכל), then *to provide, take care of*, then to have the mind upon any thing as an object of *care* or *anxiety*. The order of ideas is exactly like that in the Arabic رعى or Greek νέμω. The form, as also that of רַעְיוֹן, ver. 17, is purely Hebrew. We have the masculine form, Ps. cxxxix. 2, 17, applied to man, and used in a good sense, רֵעִי, *my thought*. "Thou knowest all my thought"—not in the sense of mere speculative thinking, but *all* my *cares*. And so in that still more tender passage, ver. 17, where it is applied to God anthropopathically מַה־יָּקְרוּ רֵעֶיךָ, "how precious are thy thoughts," thy *cares*, or *carings*, for me. Compare 1 Pet. v. 7, "He *careth* for you." In the connection with it, most of the modern commentators render רוח, wind—a *caring* or *striving* for the wind. It is, however, by no means certain that the older rendering, *spirit*, was not the right one—a *striving* (*a vain striving or vexation*) of *the spirit*. See a similar connection of רַעְיוֹן (precisely—רְעוּת) with לב, the heart, ii. 22. In that place it is not easy to distinguish רַעְיוֹן לִבּוֹ, *anxiety of his heart*, from רְעוּת רוּחַ in this.—T. L.]

[Ver. 17.—שִׂכְלוּת—הֹלֵלוֹת, abstract terms in וּת, on which some rely as proving a later language, and, consequently, a later date to the book. They are, however, like others of the kind that occur in Koheleth, purely Hebrew in their derivation whilst they have an abstract form, because the idea required here, though unusual elsewhere, demanded it. If there were but few literary compositions in the English language, it would be just as *rational* to object to one because it had several examples of words ending in *ism*, though precisely adapted to the meaning intended; and this because such a termination was not found in other books, having little or nothing of a speculative cast. These words, הֹלֵלוֹת וְשִׂכְלוּת, differ, as *madness* or *frenzy*, and *fatuity*.—T. L.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

TITLE: Ver. 1. **Words of the preacher, Son of David, King in Jerusalem.**—For the exposition of the name קֹהֶלֶת comp. the Introd. § 1. That this designation here takes the place of the historically known name, שְׁלֹמֹה, has been justly acknowledged as an indication that a poetic fiction lies before us. "All the other works of Solomon bear his usual name at their head; the Proverbs, whose title is the Proverbs of Solomon, Son of David, King of Israel; the Song of Solomon, Ps. lxxii. and Ps. cxxvii. As indeed is natural, that he who will claim authorship uses no other name than that under which he is already known. Enigma and concealment would be quite out of place here. Now if Solomon is here called Koheleth, the author clearly indicates that it has only ideal value when he is quoted as author of the book, that he appears only as the representative of wisdom. The name, which is clearly an impersonal one, shows that the person to whom it is attached *belongs only to poetry and not to reality*" (HENGSTENBERG).—Moreover, in the peculiar designation, "King in Jerusalem," instead of "King over Israel" (comp. ver. 12), we may perceive a trace of later post-Solomonic origin. On the contrary, to find in this expression a hint that the author does not dwell in Jerusalem, but somewhere in the country (according to EWALD, in Galilee), is unreasonable and too far-fetched. See § 4, Obs. 2.

2. The whole *first discourse*, which we, with EWALD. VAIH., KEIL, *etc.*, extend to the end of chap. ii., treats of the principal theme, of the vanity of all earthly things *in general;* it is therefore of an introductory and fundamental character (comp. Introd. § 2). In harmony with Keil, we again divide them into two nearly equal parts, the first of which (chap. i. 2-18) presents the vanity of the *theoretical*, and the second (chap. ii. 1-26) the vanity of the *practical* wisdom of men; or, of which, number one shows that the strivings of human wisdom after knowledge, and number two that the same efforts aiming at enjoyment and active control of reality, attain no genuine success. This division seems more simple and comprehensive than that of EWALD and VAIHINGER, who lay down three main divisions, 1) i. 2, 11; 2) i. 12; ii. 23; 3) ii. 24-26, according to EWALD, and 1) i. 2-14; 2) i. 12; ii. 19; 3) ii. 20-26, according to VAIHINGER, giving to the middle division a disproportioned length.—The first half is occupied in proving the vanity and want of success of the theoretical striving of men after wisdom, and is again divided into three divisions. For it shows, 1) by the continually recurring circle of nature and history, permitting no real progress, that the objects of human knowledge are subjected to the law of vanity (ver. 2-11); and 2) then, that to this vanity of the objective reality, there corresponds a complete futility of effort at its comprehension on the part of the human subject, so far that even the wisest of all men must be convinced by experience of the emptiness of this effort (ver. 12-18). Each of these divisions includes two strophes of three verses each, together with an introductory half strophe or proposition, so that the scheme of the whole section perfected is this: I. *Division:* The vanity of human knowledge in an objective point of view (ver. 2-11). Proposition or general preliminary remark (half strophe); ver. 2, 3. First strophe: ver. 4-7.—Second strophe: ver. 8-11. II. *Division:* The vanity of human knowledge in a subjective point of view (ver. 12-18). Proposition: ver. 12.—First strophe, ver. 13-15). Second strophe, ver. 16-18.—We follow in this strophical division the plan of VAIHINGER (also that of KEIL and HAHN), which differs materially from that of EWALD. But the latter may therein be right, that from

Digitized by Google

ver. 9 the discourse approaches prose style, and only here and there, as in ver. 15 and 18, returns to loftier poetic diction. VAIHINGER also acknowledges this, in so far as he considers the two rythmically constructed apothegms, ver. 15 and 18, as characteristic closing formulas of the two last strophes of the section (comp. Introd. § 2, p. 106).

3. *The general preliminary observation*, or, if preferred, the theme of the first discourse; ver. 2, 3.—**Vanity of vanities, saith the preacher, vanity of vanities; all is vanity.** This exclamation, containing the fundamental thought of the whole book, returns again at the close, chap. xii. 7, almost in the same words, after a previous examination has everywhere proved its truth. Nothing is wanting there but the repetition of הֲבֵל הֲבָלִים, which gives a specially solemn impression to the sentence here at the head of the whole. As to the expression "vanity of vanities" being a paraphrase of the superlative idea "extremest vanity," comp. the observation on שִׁיר הַשִּׁירִים Song of Solomon i. 1 (above, p. 1). For the punctuation הֲבֵל comp. אֲבֵל Ps. xxxv. 14, where the principal vowel is also pushed forward and lengthened to a tseri. הֶבֶל "breath, steam" (comp. CHALD. הֲבַל to become warm, to steam) is a very proper expression to mark the inconstancy, unsubstantiality, and emptiness that characterize all earthly things.* To confine this predicate of nothingness to the *actions* of men (HAHN) is the less allowable since farther on, in verses 9 and 14, human action is expressly spoken of as participating in the emptiness of worldly things; and there is previously given a much more comprehensive description of this vanity, which clearly shows that the author would understand in the "*all*" that he declares as vanity, all earthly nature and the whole circle of temporal things, (in contrast to the eternal). It is also inadmissible to accept the double הבל הבלים as subject of the sentence, instead of taking the independent, animated exclamation rather as a presupposed predicate to הַכֹּל; this pretended subject הַכֹּל would then have in the following הָבֶל another predicate, whereby the whole expression would become awkward, and essentially lose in active force and emphasis, (against ROSENMUELLER, HAHN).—As cases similar to the contents of ver. 2, comp. the passages in Ps. xc. 3–10; Ps. cii. 25–28; also Ps. xxxix. 6, 7; and also what the patriarchs were obliged to experience and confess regarding the vanity of temporal life: Gen. iv. 2; v. 29; iv. 7, 9, *etc.* Ver. 3. **What profit hath a man of all his labor which he taketh under the sun?**—(Ger., with which he fatigueth himself). Now for the first time the preacher more especially touches the vanity of human things, but means it in connection with the toil of men, as thereby declared unprofitable and unsuccessful (עָמָל, difficulty, labor, exertion, comp. ii. 22; iii. 9; v. 14, *etc.*) not only his actions, but at the same time also his spiritual strivings and searchings, of which in the sequel he principally treats; he consequently mainly means the substance of his interests and efforts, the subjective human in contrast to the objective reality of all earthly life, to which that הַכֹּל in ver. 2 referred. Vers. 2 and 3 hold therefore, substantially, the same relation to each other as the two subsequent paragraphs in vers. 4–11, and vers. 12–18. יִתְרוֹן Synonymous with יֶתֶר Gen. xlix. 3; Prov. xvii. 7; Job xx. 22, *etc.*, is found only in this book, and indicates that which is left, what remains to one; hence *profit*, *advantage*, *success*,* *acquisition*, ὅ τις εἰργάσατο, 2 John, 8, not a *superiority* over others, which signification appears most fitting in chap. ii. 13.—The בְּ in בְּכָל־עֲמָלוֹ, HAHN considers, according to Isaiah v. 25, equal to "notwithstanding, in spite of," which however is unnecessary, as the usual signification "in" or "through" affords a sufficiently good sense.—For the expression "under the sun," a characteristic and favorite form of the author, comp. vers. 14; 2, 11, 17, 20, 23; 3, 16, *etc.* The synonymous expressions "under the heaven," (ii. 3; iii. 1; i. 13;) and "upon the earth" (viii. 14, 16; xi. 2), are found elsewhere in the Old Testament. The preference of Koheleth for the form "under the sun," is doubtless explained by the fact that it instructively and clearly points to the contrast "between the eternal regularity which the sun shows in its course, and the fluctuating, vacillating, changeable doings of men, which it illuminates with its ever equal light."—(ELSTER).

4. *First division, first strophe*, verses 4–7. In an objective view, human knowledge shows itself futile, in considering the continual change of human generations on the earth, ver. 4, and the steady course of the sun, the wind, and the water (ver. 5–7).—**One generation passeth away, and another generation cometh.** הָלַךְ to go away, *abire*, as v. 15; Job x. 21; Ps. xxxix. 13. For this sentence comp. Sirach, xiv. 19: *ὡς φύλλον θάλλον ἐπὶ δένδρου δάσεος τὰ μὲν κατα βάλλει, ἀλλα δὲ φύει, οὕτως γενὲα σαρκὸς καὶ αἵματος, ἡ μὲν τελευτᾶ, ἑτέρα δὲ γεννᾶται*—a capital comparison,† which reminds us of Isa. lxiv. 5.—**But the**

---

*[The idea denoted by this frequent word is *transitoriness*, *swift passing away*; rather than *nothingness* (Nichtigkeit). Things may be very transient, yet very important—like the present human life, which St. James styles ἀτμίς (exactly equivalent to the Hebrew הֶבֶל) "a vapor that soon passeth away." James iii. The writer does not mean to call vanity, in the sense of *nothingness* or *worthlessness*, that which he says elsewhere God will surely call to judgment with all its most secret deeds.—T. L.]

*[The word which, both in composition and significance, most nearly corresponds to Koheleth's frequent יִתְרוֹן, is the Greek πλεονεξία, so much used by Paul and poorly rendered covetousness. It rather means, *having the more*, having the advantage or superiority in anything, whether wealth, fame, or ambition.—T. L.]

[†It would really seem as though Sirach, though such a thorough Jew, as his book shows him to be, had known something of the poems of Homer. There is such a striking resemblance, both in particular words and in special points of the picture, between this passage and the lines, so frequently quoted from the speech of Glaucus, Iliad VI. 146.

οἵη περ φύλλων γενεή, τοιήδε καὶ ἀνδρῶν,
φύλλα τὰ μὲν τ' ἄνεμος χαμάδις χέει, ἄλλα δὲ θ' ὕλη

Digitized by Google

earth abideth forever; (literal, "and the earth stands eternally"), (עֹמָֽדֶת as in Ps. xix. 19: Lev. xiii. 5, is of lasting existence, stands still). The copula expresses the simultaneousness of the two circumstances placed in contrast with each other: *whilst* the earth stands forever, human generations come and go incessantly. In the abiding of the earth, the poet doubtless thinks of its foundation on pillars over the water, to which Ps. xxiv. 2; civ. 5; Job xxxviii. 6, and other poetical passages allude. But whether, at the same time, the earth is considered the arena of the curse and sinful misery brought in by men (Gen. iii. 17-19), as a vale of sorrow, and a place of misfortune, so that the thought were: men effect nothing lasting on earth, new races of men must ever begin where the old ones ceased, must ever repeat the same Sisyphus labor as their fathers (HENGSTENBERG, HAHN): this is doubtful on account of the expression לְעוֹלָם. This certainly indicates not an endless eternity in the strictest sense of the word, but only "a future of unlimited length," (HENGSTENBERG); but it shows the intention to bring out, as a principal thought, the character of the continual and everlasting in contrast with the appearance of continual change, and points thus to the inability of human investigation and knowledge to hold any firm position in the midst of such change everlasting as the duration of the earth.—Ver. 5. **The sun ariseth, and the sun goeth down, and hasteth to the place where he arose.** The first half of this verse, is an exact parallel of the first clause of ver. 4, the second corresponds in substance to the thought in the second clause of that verse. For, as in the former, the earth, the scene of the coming and going of the generations of men, so in the latter the "place" of the sun (*i. e.*, its subterranean, heavenly dwelling-place, from which it daily enters upon its new course, comp. Ps. xix. 6), is contrasted as abiding in the presence of continual change. As the human race, with every change of its individuals, makes no advance, as its history presents no real progress, so is the motion of the sun apparently a continual circuit, without arrival at any fixed goal, or lasting place of rest. Contrary to the accents, the SEPTUAGINT, VULGATE, CHALDAIC, LUTHER, ELSTER, HITZIG, HAHN, *etc.*, connect וְאֶל־מְקוֹמוֹ שׁוֹאֵף closely with the preceding; "and hastens to its place, and there ariseth again. But שׁאף belongs clearly to what follows, and also does not mean running, hastening, but (as הֵפִיחַ in Hab. 2, 3) *gasping after air, panting, longing*"—a sense which strikingly delineates the movement of the sun, striving to reach the vault of heaven, although in it there lies a conception somewhat different from this: "and rejoiceth as a strong man to run a race," Ps. xix. 5. For HENGSTENBERG clearly brings into the text the joyous desire, the pretended image of "the vigorous courage of the new generation." It rather points to the idea of the exhaustion of the sun on account of its ever restless motion, and this doubtless with the intention of directly showing the depressing influence produced by observing the ever recurring circuit of this body, and the discouragement in this endless uniformity, that presents itself to the comprehension of the human observer (comp. ELSTER on this passage).* Ver. 6. **It goeth to the South, and turneth to the North.** (Literal of the Ger. text). The sun is naturally not the subject (*Sept. Syriac, M. Geier, etc.*), but the wind named in the second clause, for only of it can it be said, "it turneth to the north." But south and north are here used with the wind, because the other cardinal points had been previously used with the sun, to prevent an unpleasant repetition. The author could scarcely have thought of anything like the law of the revolution of the winds (WOLFGANG MENZEL, in his Natural History conceived in the Christian spirit I. 270); for he had just asserted in ver. 4, that the earth stands eternally still. The opinion of HAHN is also objectionable, that the poet was desirous of showing the continual change between warm and cold wind, and this change from warmth to cold was to depict the vicissitude of happiness and unhappiness in human life, as, in the preceding verse, that from night to day. Such an allegorizing of the passage is the less justifiable because the circuit of the waters described in ver. 7 can only be con-

τηλεθόωσα φύει ἔαρος δ' ἐπιγίγνεται ὥρη,
ὣς ἀνδρῶν γενεὴ, ἡ μὲν φύει ἡ δ' ἀπολήγει.

The race of man is like the race of leaves:
Of leaves. one generation by the wind
Is scattered on the earth; another soon,
In spring's luxuriant verdure, bursts to light.
So with our race; *these flourish, those decay.*
Lord Derby's Translation.—T. L.].

*[There is a concealed metaphor in this passage all the more beautiful because of its inobtrusiveness. It is contained in the words זרח and שׁאף, *beaming (radiating) glowing, panting.*—See Metrical Version. It is the figure of the race horse returning *panting* to his goal, whence he started—

All panting, glowing, there again is he.

Such a mode of conceiving was at the origin of the classical figure: the horses of the sun panting up the eastern steep [comp Ps xix. 6]. See both figures combined, as they are here, *Virg. Æn.* XII. 113.

Postea vix summos spargebat lumine montes
Orta dies, cum primo alto se gurgite tollunt
Solis equi, lucemque elatis naribus efflant.

See also the Georgics, Lib. I. 250:

Aut redit a nobis aurora, diemque reducit,
Nosque ubi primus equis oriens afflavit anhelis.

To all thinking minds, the idea of the earth being a sphere, or a body lying in space, with space all round it, above and below—or having, at least, an under as well as an upper side—must have been very early. It was at once suggested by this constant phenomenon of sun-setting and sun-rising—going down below on the West (his tabernacle or sleeping-tent, as the Psalmist compares it, Ps. xix. 5), and rising in the East as one who came from below, and *ascended "a steep*, weary. yet glorious"—like a bridegroom coming forth from his chamber (Ps. xix. 6) or as a strong man (an athlete) to run a race. Compare the same image, though reversed, *Iliad.* VI. 506. It was the same sun, and he must have gone under (into his "subterranean heavenly abode," as Zöckler well calls it) and around again to his starting place. The heavens would be all round it, and, thus, as the Psalmist graphically paints, these under heavens would be his tabernacle, where he spends the night, as it *appears* to us. We detect the image in the early Hesiodean cosmogony, where it is said that "*γαῖα* (earth) gave birth to starry *οὐρανὸς* corresponding to herself," ἶσον ἑαυτῇ. *Hes. Theog.* 127. It was almost obvious to sense, and the musing mind must have been very early familiar with the conception. It was not inconsistent with the other notion that appears in Scripture, of the earth as an extended plain. The latter was phenomenal, the former the product of reflection. Both were adapted to poetry—the one to the poetry of the *eye*, the other to that of the *thought*. Compare Job xxvi. 7, "He hangeth the earth upon nothing," or, rather, "over emptiness."—T. L.].

Digitized by Google

sidered a picture of the change from happiness to unhappiness by virtue of a forced and highly artificial interpretation. The more careful allegorical interpretation tried by HENGSTENBERG, according to which sun, wind, and water are all symbols of human existence moving in the circuit of vanity, is not indeed sufficiently justified by the context. **The wind goeth ever whirling** (Lit. Ger.). The twice repeated סוֹבֵב expresses continual repetition, the everlasting, and the ever-returning change of the wind; comp. the reduplication of ideas with the same intent in Gen. xiv. 10; Deut. ii. 27; xiv. 22; Mark vi. 39. This double סוֹבֵב is subordinate to הוֹלֵךְ presenting the main idea, just as שׁוֹאֵף in ver. 5 is to זוֹרֵחַ.—**And the wind returneth again according to his circuits.**—That is, the circuits which it has already made, it ever makes again, it ever repeats the courses that it has previously described; for that is, properly speaking, the סְבִיבוֹת, not circles (*Sept. Vulg.*, *Ewald*, *Knobel*, *etc*). The translation "on its circuits or circles" (EWALD, KNOBEL, *etc.*) or also "according to its circuits" (ROSENMUELLER) is unnecessary; for that עַל, with verbs of motion, especially שׁוּב, has the sense of *to*, *until*, (exactly synonymous, in such case, with עַד) is proved by such passages as Prov. xxvi. 11; Ps. xix. 7; xlviii. 11; Job xxxvii. 3, and also by the circumstance that, in the later Chaldaic style, עַל is mostly synonymous with אֶל. [In the above passage Zöckler translates *zu seinen Wendungen.*—W.].

Ver. 7. **All the rivers run into the sea; yet the sea is not full**, *i. e.*, it does not overflow notwithstanding the immense masses of water that it constantly receives; it does not overwhelm and swallow up the land. In הַיָּם, the author doubtless refers to the ocean, not to the Dead Sea, as HITZIG arbitrarily supposes. The previous mention of the sun, the wind, and the four cardinal points, show conclusively that he deals with great cosmophysical ideas, and thus hardly thinks merely of the streams like the Jordan flowing into the Dead Sea, or indeed of the contracted relations of Palestine at all. Comp. also ARISTOPHANES in his "*Clouds*," v. 1294, *et seq.*:

> αὕτη μὲν (ἡ θάλαττα) οὐδὲν γίγνεται
> ἐπιῤῥεόντων τῶν ποταμῶν πλείων, σὺ δὲ
> ζητεῖς ποιῆσαι τἀργύριον πλεῖον τὸ σόν.

Unto the place from whence the rivers come, thither they return again. Literal, "thither are the rivers to go returning," thither they always take their course again. For this construction examine 1 Sam. xx. 19; Hos. v. 11, *etc*; as in the English, (they are going), the participle here expresses the continuous character of the action. For the construct state before the relative clause (which is, as it were, regarded as a single noun) comp. passages such as Gen. xl. 3; Lev. iv. 24; (EWALD, *Manual.* § 822, c.).—As it is not absolutely necessary that הלך must express the "going whither," but may also well express the going out, or the coming whence, as ver. 6 shows, therefore, מְקוֹם שֶׁהַנְּחָלִים הֹלְכִים does not mean the ocean as the common collecting-place of all river-water (ELSTER, VAIHINGER, *etc.*), but rather as the occasional source and origin of the individual rivers. The return of the water from the ocean the author certainly thinks effected in a way corresponding to the natural course of things, namely, that of exhalations, and clouds, and falling mists, and not by means of secret subterraneous canals and passages, as LUTHER, ROSENMUELLER, *et al.*, pretend. See Gen. ii. 6; Job xxxvi. 27, 28.—Also UMBREIT, HITZIG, and HENGSTENBERG on this passage.

5. *First division, second strophe*, ver. 8-11. As the natural objects of human knowledge truly satisfy neither the eye nor the ear (ver. 8), so there predominates in the history of mankind a restless flight of events, crowding and following each other in endless circuit, which necessarily destroy, in equal measure, both the interest in new acquirements, and the endeavor to remember the things that are past (ver. 11).—**All things are full of labor, man cannot utter it.**—The words כָּל־הַדְּבָרִים יְגֵעִים are understood by exegetists to mean either: "all words are troublesome, weary" (SEPT., EWALD, ELSTER, HITZIG, HENGSTENBERG, HAHN, *etc.*), or: "all things fatigue, are full of burden and trouble" (HIERONYMUS, LUTHER, ROSENMUELLER, VAIHINGER, *etc.*). The ruling signification in this book, as every where in the Old Testament of דבר = λόγος, *sermo*, as well as the closely following remark, "man cannot utter it" (יוּכַל לְדַבֵּר), seem to speak in favor of the former meaning. But the word דבר, as meaning *thing*, is found also in ver. 10; chap. vi. 12; vii. 8; and it appears, in every view of the case, more appropriate that the quality of wearying, of producing discouragement and indifference, should be predicated of the things of the world, and the objects of human knowledge, than that the words relating to the naming and judging of these things, should be designated as feeble or exhausting. This first meaning would also produce a tautology of הַדְּבָרִים with לְדַבֵּר, which one could scarcely attribute to an author who, on the whole, expresses himself with such choice and delicacy. Thus the sense of the line remains in every case that which is accepted even by most of the defenders of the first conception; namely, to recount all objects of human knowledge and experience is fatiguing in the extreme, and is indeed impracticable; no speech can perfectly give the impression which is produced on our mind by the thought of physical endlessness, and of the never changing operations and life of the forces of nature (comp. ELSTER on this passage). For the active sense of יָגֵעַ, which elsewhere, as in Deut. xxv. 18; 2 Sam. xvii. 2, expresses the passive thought, "faint," "weary," but here is clearly exhaustive, making weary, examine the similar significations of נִמְרָץ ,נַחְלָה ,אָנוּשׁ in Isa. xvii. 11; Jer. xxx. 12; Micah ii. 10; and also the Latin

tristis in the sense of making sad, depressing; and the German "*betrübt*" in phrases like: "*es ist betrubt zu sehen*," *etc.*—**The eye is not satisfied with seeing, nor the ear filled with hearing.**—No remarkable quality is here affirmed of the eye or the ear; it is only intended to delineate more closely the relation held to the expression, "all things are wearying." "If the eye should become satisfied, so that it would no longer see, then the narrating word must step in and be able in its turn also to master things. But the abundance of phenomena, which presses on eye, ear, and the remaining senses, is endless; there are always objects which the eye must see, does see, and brings to him who would gladly close his labors" (HITZIG). For parallel passages comp. Prov. xxvii. 20. For מִשְּׁמֹעַ, lit. "away from hearing," *i. e.*, so that it may hear no longer, comp. Gen. xxvii. 1; Ex. xiv. 5; 1 Sam. viii. 7; Isa. xxiv. 10, *etc.*—Ver. 9. **The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be**; or also; "what has happened, that will again happen, that will occur anew." מַה שֶּׁהָיָה cannot be considered a question (LXX. *τί τὸ γεγονός* Vulg. *quid est quod fuit*); for in this book מַה־שֶּׁ is always equivalent to "that which," or "whatever;" see iii. 15; vi. 10; viii. 7; x. 14; and examine for the same Chaldaic style, Dan. ii. 25; Ezra vii. 18.—**And that which is done, is that which shall be done.**—As the former refers to the objective course of natural laws and phenomena, so this parallel expression alludes to the subjective efforts and actions of men; and the progress to any thing really new is denied of both.—**And there is no new thing under the sun.**—Lit. there is not in existence any thing new, (וְאֵין כָּל־חָדָשׁ). For the placing of this negation before כָּל, to indicate the total non-existence of any thing, comp. Judges xiii. 4; Ps. cxliii. 2; 2 Kings iv. 2; also similar Hebrew terms in the New Testament Greek, Matt. xxiv. 22; Rom. iii. 20; Gal. ii. 16, *etc.*—For this sentence comp. Seneca especially; Epist. xxiv.: *Nullius rei finis est, sed in orbem nexa sunt omnia. Omnia transeunt ut revertantur, nil novi video, nil novi facio;* also *Tacitus*, *Annal.* III. 55: *Rebus cunctis inest quidam velut orbis, ut quemadmodum temporum vices, ita morum versentur;* and *Marc. Aurel. Comment., ad se ipsum*, VI. 31: *ὁ τὰ νῦν ὁρῶν πάντα ἑώρακεν, ὅσα τὲ ἐξ ἀϊδιόυ ἐγένετο, καὶ ὅσα εἰς τὸ ἄπειρον ἔσται· πάντα γὰρ ὁμογενῆ καὶ ὁμοειδῆ*; *Ibid.* VII. 1: *οὐδὲν καινὸν· πάντα καὶ συνήθη καὶ ὀλιγχρόνια*; *Ibid.* VII. 26: *πᾶν τὸ γινόμενον οὕτως ἀεὶ ἐγενετο καὶ γενήσεται καὶ νῦν πανταχοῦ γίνεται.*

Ver. 10. **Is there any thing whereof it may be said, See, this is new? it hath been already of old time which was before us.**—The first half of this verse is a hypothetical preliminary clause, introduced by יֵשׁ דָּבָר, to which is added the after clause without a copula, for the sake of greater emphasis; comp. similarly formed conditional sentences in ver. 18.—כְּבָר, *long ago, already long since* (Sept. *ἤδη*; Vulg. *jam*), is one of the characteristic Aramaic* particles of the book, allied to כְּבָרָה "greatness, length," and the Arab. Kibar, great age; (comp. *Introd.* § 4, Obs. 2). The word לְעֹלָמִים, added as a more special definition, indicates that the meaning of "long ago" is to be understood in the sense of time of eternal length; or also that it continues in endless spaces of time;† for the preposition לְ, in the sense of "within," comp. Gen. vii. 4; Ezra x. 8, and Elster on this passage.—Instead of אֲשֶׁר הָיוּ there stands at the close אֲשֶׁר הָיָה מִלְּפָנֵינוּ because הָיָה is used impersonally, in the sense: "*there have been*" (comp. Gen. xlvii. 24; Ex. xii. 49); an *enallage numeri*, that could easily occur with a neuter plural like עֹלָמִים. EWALD takes the words as subject of the sentence, and translates them thus: "what occurred before our eyes had already been long ago." But this position of the subject at the end of the sentence would be harsh and without motive; and for מִלְּפָנֵינוּ, which means according to Isa. xli. 26 simply "before us, earlier than we," would necessarily stand לְפָנֵינוּ if the translation "before our eyes, in our presence," were the correct one.—Ver. 11. **There is no remembrance of former things.**—Clearly an explanation of the thought of the preceding verse, which we need not (as HITZIG and ELSTER) connect with what precedes through the conception: "that our considering old things as new is because of the continual extinction of the remembrance of former things." For the construct state זִכְרוֹן before a following noun with a preposition, comp. similar cases, as Ezek. xiii. 2 Sam. i. 21.—רִאשֹׁנִים and אַחֲרֹנִים signify every where the earlier and the later ones (Lev. xxvi. 45; Deut. xix. 14; Ps. lxxix. 8; Isa. lxi. 4; also chap. iv. 16 of this book, consequently ancestry and posterity. The neuter idea, "the earlier," would necessarily be expressed by the feminine רִאשֹׁנוֹת (Isa. xlii. 9; xlvi. 9; xlviii. 3).—**With those that shall come after.**—לָאַחֲרֹנוֹת in future, later. Comp. for the substantive אַחֲרִנָה, Deut. xiii. 9; 2 Sam. ii. 26.

6. *Second Division.* Proposition and first strophe. Ver. xii. 15. In a subjective view human knowledge proves futile and vain, in so far as all the desires and enterprises of men, to which it is directed, are empty and vain, and lead to nothing. **I, the preacher, was King**

*[There is no more reason for calling כְּבָר an Aramaic word here, than the feminine form, כִּבְרָה. Gen. xxxv. 16; xlviii. 7; 2 Kings v. 19. It means a considerable but indefinite amount whether of *space* as in the examples in Gen. xxxv. 16 or of *time* as here—*some distance off*, or *some time ago*—*long ago*. The same may be said of מַכְבִּיר Job xxxv. 16; xxxvi. 31.—T. L.]

†[לְעֹלָמִים] is rather added as an amplification of the indefinite כְּבָר. It hath been already—long ago—yes, in some of the olams (or worlds), cosmical or historical, that have gone before in the immense past. See remarks in note on the olamic words, p. 41, &c.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

over Israel in Jerusalem.—Observe the preterit, הָיִיתִי, I was—a clear indication that a later personage than the historical Solomon says this.* For even in his most advanced age Solomon, who, according to 1 Kings xi. 40-43, was reigning king until his death, could not have spoken of his kingdom as something belonging solely to the past. For the remaining allusions in this verse to a period later than the Solomonic, see above on ver. 1 (No. 1), and the *Introduction*, § 4. And moreover the author, assuming the character of Solomon, indicates for his own person a condition in life which affords him a broad view, rich experience, and knowledge of men; comp. Sirach xxxviii. 24 ff.—Ver. 13. **And I gave my heart to seek and search out by wisdom.**—That is, I gave it entirely to that seeking, exerted myself zealously on that account; comp. שִׂים לֵב, Isa. xli. 42; שִׁית לֵב, Ps. xlviii. 14; and הֵכִין לֵב, Job xi. 13. "To seek" (דָּרַשׁ) and "to search" (תּוּר) are distinguished from one another—the former by being less thorough, and the latter by penetrating more deeply and searching after the hidden. בַּחָכְמָה is not "wisely" (LUTHER, comp. *Vulgate, sapienter*), but "with wisdom;" for wisdom was the instrument with which he made his investigations;† (for the well-known old Hebrew sense, see the *Introd.* to the Solomonic books, Vol. XII. p. 8 of this work.)—**Concerning all things that are done under heaven.**—Thereby is clearly meant only the actions and lives of men, and not occurrences in the realm of nature, for which latter the verb נַעֲשָׂה would be very unfittingly chosen. And what has happened in itself is not so much meant as its character, worth, aim and success as an object of seeking and searching; therefore, to search concerning all things that are done (עַל כָּל וגו).—**This sore travail,** *etc.*—Human action itself is not designated here as עִנְיַן רָע, as sore travail or pain (HITZIG, HAHN), but the zealous searching, the critical endeavor of the wise observer of life, who every where meets only vanity and emptiness, and with all his theoretical and practical experimenting with life, reaches no lasting enjoyment and success (and thus with justice the most exegetists; see ELSTER on this passage).—**God hath given to the sons of man to be exercised therewith.**—This unsuccessful and vain striving after wisdom, to which man feels himself impelled by a natural necessity, is imparted to him by God himself; it is a part of the salutary and disciplinary curse that God has laid on human nature since the fall, a "part of the whole system by which the Lord humbles fallen man, and therewith prepares the redemption" (HENGSTENBERG).—Ver. 14. **I have seen all the works that are done under the sun; and behold, all is vanity and vexation of spirit.**—(Lit., "windy effort," *i. e.*, "an effort of the wind") (Sept. προαίρεσις πνεύματος) an effort without result, that effects no lasting good. Comp. Hos. xii. 2, which passage gives us at the same time the proper sense of the expression רְעוּת. For the formula רדף קדים there used parallel with רָעָה רוּחַ, "to consume wind," really means to follow after the wind, to be in quest of it, a diligent striving after it (comp. רעה in passages like Prov. xiii. 20: xv. 14; Isa. xliv. 20). רְעוּת is consequently the bearing, the intention of one zealously aiming at, consequently striving, continuous direction of the will (thus also Ezra v. 7, 18), the same as רַעְיוֹן, which in i. 17; iv. 16 is also found connected with רוּחַ. It is therefore erroneous to derive it from רצץ — רעע, to shatter, to break into pieces (thus the Vulg. "*afflictio spiritus*," also Chald. Raschi *et al.*).—Ver. 15. **That which is crooked cannot be made straight, and that which is wanting cannot be numbered.**—Clearly a proverbial sentence, which the author perhaps found ready made in the rich treasury of the proverbial wisdom of his people, and used here to strengthen what he had said in ver. 14. The sense is, as the parallel passage, chap. vii. 13, shows, that human action and effort, in spite of all exertion, cannot alter that which has once been arranged and fixed by God. "Man cannot alter what is (apparently) unjust in God's arrangement of the world, nor make or regard its failures perfect; hemmed in within the narrow limits of the world as it is constituted, he is not able to perform the most important thing that he above all things should be able to do" (HITZIG). This thought is not fatalistic (as KNOBEL supposes); for, as numerous other passages of this book show (namely, iii. 17; vii. 20 ff.; xi. 9; xii. 14), the author knows very well that human sin is the cause of the incapacity here described in contrast with the unchangeable and divine order of the world, and considers this inability as one of self-guilt on the part of man.—"That which is wanting cannot be numbered," *i. e.*, not completed, not be brought to its full number; comp. the Lat. *ad numeros suos redigi=perfici*, and also our German proverbs: "Where there is nothing, nothing farther is to be counted;" or, "There the emperor has lost his right," *etc.*

7. *Second Division, second strophe.* Vers. 16-18. Practically experiencing wisdom, striving after positive knowledge, is, as the critically observing, thoroughly futile, reaching no lasting result, because its acquirement is inseparably connected

* [This is certainly a slender basis on which to build such an argument. The indefinite use of the Hebrew tenses will not allow it to have much force, and, moreover, it is perfectly consistent (even if rendered *was*) with the condition of an old man, an old king, who had seen the vanity of the world, and of royal estate, and wished to impress it on the mind of his reader, to speak of it as something past and gone. I who was king—or, when I was king—in the full exercise of power and dignity. Besides, if there is an inconsistency, it would be full as great in one who assumes to personate Solomon. Such a one would be even more careful to guard against *obvious* anachronisms, as this would be, if thus regarded. See WORDSWORTH on the expression, and the argument drawn from it. The word Koheleth may be a scholium of the later compiler, to explain (though unnecessarily) what he deemed abrupt: I (Koheleth) was King; and so in other places like similar scholia in the Pentateuch.—T. L.]

† [בַּחָכְמָה does not mean *wisely* in the sense of *knowingly*, or *skilfully*—neither does it mean *by*, or, *with wisdom*, as an instrument, though that is nearer to it; but rather *in the way of wisdom*, that is *philosophically*, *speculatively*, *theoretically*, in distinction from *experimentally* or *practically*, as he did afterwards.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

with pain and discouragement.—**I communed with my own heart, saying,** *i. e.*, I entered inwardly into my own counsel; comp. the Lat. *cogitare cum animo suo*, and in the Hebrew similar phrases דִּבֵּר בְּלִבּוֹ, Ps. xv. 2; ד׳ אֶל־לִבּוֹ, Gen. xxiv. 45; עַל לִבּוֹ, 1 Sam. i. 13.—**Lo, I am come to great estate, and have gotten more wisdom.**—The word הִגְדַּלְתִּי (comp. Isa. xxviii. 29) intimates that he possessed great wisdom before; the word הוֹסַפְתִּי, that during his life he continually increased it. Comp. 1 Kings v. 9-11.—**Than all they that have been before me in Jerusalem.**—The first עַל is comparative, as in Gen. xlviii. 22; Ps. xvi. 2. From the second עַל before יְרוּשָׁלִָם it appears that with the here mentioned predecessors of Koheleth real kings* are meant (comp. also ii. 7). The allusion here can scarcely be to the old Canaanitish princes (Adoni-zedek, Josh. x. 1; or, indeed, Melchisedec, Gen. xv. 18), but to the crowned heads of Israel, who alone were competent to the realization of חָכְמָה. This passage contains, again, therefore, a reference to the difference between the author of this work and Solomon, but still not one of that kind that we are justified in reproaching him (with Hitzig) of ignorance of history. He rather commits this offence against actual history with the same absence of suspicion and purpose which permitted him to adapt his work only loosely and distantly to the personal and temporal relations of Solomon, and every where to dispense with the strict carrying out of the historical fiction in question. (Comp. *Introd.* § 4).—**Yea, my heart had great experience of wisdom and knowledge.**—Concerning דַּעַת as synonym of חָכְמָה comp. Prov. i. 2. "To see, to behold wisdom and knowledge," is as much as acquiring it by experience, arriving at its possession and enjoyment. This beholding is attributed to the heart, because it is indeed the seat or instrument of aspiration after wisdom,† see vers. 13 and 17.—Ver. 17. **And I gave my heart to know wisdom and to know madness and folly**—that is, I applied myself to learning not only the positive and normal contents of human knowledge, but also its counterpart, error and perversion in their various forms: according to the principle: *contrariis contraria intelliguntur.* הוֹלֵלוֹת = הֹלֵלוֹת, chap. x. 13; comp. the similar formation חָכְמוֹת, Prov. i. 20; ix. 1, *etc.*, and Ewald, *Manual*, § 165 *c*), and שִׂכְלוּת, want of sense and folly are also thus placed together in chap. ii. 12 only, that the latter word is written סִכְלוּת with more etymological exactness (comp. also ii. 3, 13, *etc.*).—*I perceived that this also is vexation of spirit.* For רַעְיוֹן רוּחַ see ver. 14; and comp. רַעְיוֹן לִבּוֹ, the striving of his heart, chap. ii. 22, as well as the same word in the Chaldee of the Book of Daniel (iv. 16; v. 6, 10; vii. 28), where it signifies thought. זֶה הוּא, a pleonasm, of which there are many in the book. Ver. 18. **For in much wisdom is much grief; and he that increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow.**—Ger. Proverb: "Much wisdom causeth headache;" also Cicero, *Tusc.* III. 4: "*videtur mihi cadere in sapientem ægritudo,*" and what Elster remarks on this passage: "Such an enlargement of the practical knowledge of human life destroys the natural ease and simplicity of the individual life, and by comparisons with others, awaking the consciousness of being variously affected in one's own existence through influences operating from without, produces a feeling of insignificance and feebleness of each individual life as such; and by exciting man to many aspirations and desires which remain unfulfilled, and therefore leave painful impressions behind. It is still more important to think of the manifold disillusions which a deeper insight of the moral arena in a stricter sense produces, because it not only teaches how confidence in the strength and worth of individuals is often unjustifiable, but also shows how in the great and sacred institutions of humanity, which have originally a purely ethical aim, this ethical object is frequently lost, and that those only exist in reality through a linking of interests that are entirely foreign to their real nature."—וְיוֹסִיף is an antecedent: "and if one gathers wisdom, if one makes much wisdom." Ewald, Elster, *et al.*, consider יוֹסִיף (here as well as in Isa. xxix. 14; xxxviii. 5) an active participle from the stem reverting from Hiphil, into Kal, with ׳— instead of ֵ— (Ewald, *Manual*, § 127 b.; 169 a) while others find in it simply an impersonal future Hiphil, and compare it on account of the *scriptio plena* with הוֹסַפְתִּי ver. 16.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

Human effort, confined to the conditions of life and the objects of knowledge of this earthly world, can attain no enduring wealth of happiness or success, either in a practical or theoretical relation. For every thing that is accomplished under the sun, that is, in this contracted sublunary world subjected to the curse of temporality, is, like the great heavenly light of our planet, or, like the mysterious course of the wind and the water, confined to a changeless circuit beyond which there is no progress. All efforts after the attainment of a higher and more durable happiness, which man by means of his own natural power may institute, fail at this stern barrier of the earthly and temporal. Be it the cheerful enjoyment of life, and the active cooperation with it, be it fulness of knowledge and wealth of treasures, of intellectual truth and insight, as long as man, standing simply in his own strength as a mere child of earth, commanding no other than earthly and natural powers, endeavors to place himself in possession of these

*[This is entirely gratuitous. It may refer to any men of note and wealth, together with David and Saul, or the writer may well have had in view old Princes in Jerusalem, away back to the days of Melchisedec.—T. L.]

†[The word לֵב, *heart*, is used in Hebrew (especially in the Proverbs and Solomonic writings) as much for the *mind* or *intellect* as for the *feeling—the affections.*—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

treasures, will he be ever obliged to experience the utter vanity of his labors. Only in submission to the eternally Divine, which remains fixed and constant in all the vicissitudes of time, (Ps. cii. 25 ff.), does he obtain the power to overcome the imperfections and annoyances of temporal existence, or, at least, true consolation while suffering their pressure. Faith alone is the anchor of safety which is able to preserve the bark of life, tossed to and fro by the storms of time, from sinking into the awful depths of despair and inconsolable doubts regarding our temporal and eternal welfare.

Of these fundamental thoughts of the section before us, only those referring to the vanity of earthly life and its wisdom are specially treated. Of the religious solution of the conflict, which, according to numerous and prominent allusions in the subsequent pages, forms the deeper background for the grievous lamentations of the preacher, there penetrates, for the time, scarcely anything through his picture of the vanity of all earthly things. It is, substantially, only the sad contrast between human aspirations after wisdom, and the absolutely unsatisfying result in this world, to whose description the author directs his attention; that conflict between the ardent desire of life and its enjoyment, between thirst after knowledge and its failure, whose deep significance FABRI, in his work—"*Time and Eternity*"—has as strikingly as beautifully delineated when, in p. 10 f., in direct connection with the lamenting commencement of this book he says: "Who does not know, from his own thousandfold experience, this wonderful feeling of a deep temporal grief that often, as an armed foe, overwhelms the spirit of man with a secret shudder in the midst of the loudest merriment? Who does not know the pressure and the pain of time, when we see it in steady flow hurrying quietly by us, nay, when we see ourselves, entirely helpless, carried away by its stream, and daily approaching nearer to the limits of life? Do we not then feel as the occupant of a frail boat, which, drawn into the current of a mighty stream, finds itself carried down with arrowy speed, and if not in its course dashed to pieces on the rocks, hastens with inevitable destiny to the cataract that is to bury it in that deep from which no one may ever rise and begin the course anew?" That is the *periculum vitæ*, the danger of life, of which the wise men of old have spoken, and have recognized as the inevitable destiny of every thing born into this lower world. Thus time, with its restless and continuous going and coming, appeals to the direct feelings of every man as an oppressive destiny, as a travail, as Solomon says, (ver. 13, 18), as a tragic conflict between what ought to be and what is.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

In the homiletical treatment of the section, the evangelical preacher should not be satisfied in merely presenting this sad conflict without its solution; he should rather connect with the lament concerning the vanity of earthly things, the consolation of the unchanging grace of the Eternal One; and thus regard the gloomy picture of the author in the light of divine revelation, to which the entire course and contents of the book encourage us. In this intent we might use the entire chapter as a text for a connected view whose theme might be as follows: That which is visible is temporal, that which is invisible is eternal (2 Cor. iv. 17); or also —"For we know in part, and we prophesy in part." "But when that which is perfect is come, that which is in part shall be done away." (1 Cor. xiii. 9, 10); or: The flight of earthly things, its cause and its cure, (with reference to the 90th Psalm, and appropriate spiritual hymns). In case the text is divided, there should not be more than two parts. Then make vers. 2–11 the text for the thought: "There is nothing new under the sun;" and from 12–18 for the thought: "In much wisdom there is much grief."

With a view to the practical treatment of the individual passages, examine the following homiletical hints and helps from ancient and modern exegetical writings.

Ver. 2. LUTHER:—In the introduction he gives us the subject of the whole book, when he tells us that there is the greatest vanity in all human pursuits, to such a degree that men, neither content with the present, nor able to enjoy the future, turn even their best things into misery and vanity, all through their own fault, not that of the things themselves.

M. GEIER:—The more the vanity of the world is discovered, the more will the disgust of it increase in the true Christian; and on the contrary, a desire will arise for the heavenly and eternal.—HENGSTENBERG:—The right solution of the problem is this: Between the assertion—"And behold, all was very good," and that other: "All is vanity," lies the fact of the fall. With this latter a whole new order of things has appeared. The creation, which was good in itself, was no longer fitting for degenerate man. "All is vanity," is no accusation of God. It is rather, if we keep in view the nature of man, a praise of God. It is precisely in this doom of punishment, and in the adjustment of the economy of the Cross, that God shows Himself especially great and glorious.

Ver. 3. LUTHER:—The creature is indeed subject to vanity, as Paul testifies, Rom. viii., but nevertheless the things themselves are good. Otherwise he would have called the sun itself a vanity; but this he excepts, because he says, *under* the sun. It is not, therefore, of the works of God he treats, which are all good and true, and above the sun, but the works beneath the sun,—what we do here in this earthly life.—STARKE:—Since with decay the profit of all outward occupation vanishes, it is folly for men to be so absorbed with external things that they thereby forget the care of their own souls.

Vers. 4–7. CRAMER:—That the world has not existed from eternity, one sees in all its parts, because these are not fixed and constant; the whole cannot, therefore, remain unchanged. But the constant order in creatures and their employments, proves that there is a God who sustains every thing.—STARKE:—In nature every thing is governed by the laws of motion; how much more should man direct his steps according to the rules of life prescribed to him by God (Gal. vi. 16; Ps. cxix. 9; c. 5).—WOHLFARTH:

Digitized by Google

—The existence of the world clearly depends upon the unchangeable order given to nature by God, and just because it follows these divine laws without deviation, is nature, yet to-day, as it was thousands of years ago, the inexhaustible dispenser of the blessings and joys of men. Let us herein acknowledge the wisdom, goodness, and might of the Eternal One, and adore him who once said: "Let there be!" and there was! who called the sun of the day, as well as the night, into existence, who prescribed to the waters their course, and gave command to the winds. Let us comprehend that we can only then be happy and make others happy, when, as nature unconsciously obeys natural laws, we obey with clear consciousness the commands of virtue and the laws of nature for the spirit world.

Ver. 8. ZEYSS:—The immortal spirit of man can find no real rest in temporal things, but only in God, the highest and eternal good, Matt. xi. 29.—HANSEN:—External things do not satisfy. David in Ps. xvii. 15 gives us clearly to understand that he recognizes the same truth; for he says: "I will behold thy face in righteousness," and adds, "I shall be satisfied, when I awake, with thy likeness." He hopes, therefore, in the contemplation of God, to obtain what he cannot have in the form of this world. And for this very reason Solomon calls all things vain that belong to this sensual life.—BERLEB. BIBLE:—"The avenues of the soul bear many thousand objects or things to the heart, with which man fatigues and distracts himself, as with a boundless mountain of sand. From these his mind forms numberless images, which he gazes at, and inwardly handles. From these come the manifold thoughts and the distracted spirit of poor man. Therefore, by apostacy from God, his Creator, he has gone out with his heart after many things, and now, instead of God, in whom he would eternally have had enough, he embraces so many thousand creatures in his desires, and cannot even then be satisfied. For the immortal essence of the soul can by no means repose in the empty creature; it seeks ever farther, and will ever have more; it is a fire that burns without ceasing, and would gladly seize all things."

Vers. 9-11. LUTHER:—If we understand these words, *nothing new* beneath *the sun*, of the things themselves, and of the works of God, it would not be true. For God is every day doing what is new; but *we* do nothing new, because the old Adam is in all. Our ancestors abused things, just as we abuse them. Alexander, Cæsar, had the same disposition; so had all Kaisars and Kings; so have we. As they could never be satisfied, so never can we; they were wicked; so are we.—CRAMER:—No man has so great a cross that he finds none like himself; for we are not better than our fathers, 1 Kings xix. 5.—HENGSTENBERG:—"There is nothing new under the sun;" let that serve to sober down the fantasies which gather grapes from the thorns of the world, but not discourage the friends of the Kingdom of God, which has its real seat, not under the sun, but above the sun, and whose heavenly protector, by ever creating new things (Jer. xxxi. 22) gives material to a new song, Ps. xl. 4.

Vers. 13-15. LUTHER [to ver. 14]:—All painful anxiety and care in making provision, whether in public or private, through our own counsels, and our own wisdom, are condemned in this book. God disappoints the thoughts and plans that are not grounded on His word. And rightly too; for why should we prescribe and add to His wisdom? Let us learn, then, to submit to His counsels, and abstain from those cares and thoughts which God has not commanded.—Ver. 15. Human concerns cannot be so managed as that all things should be rightly done, and that there should not still remain many evils. The best way, then, is to walk in faith, which lets God reign, prays for the coming of His Kingdom, tolerating in the meantime, and patiently enduring, all evils, or committing them to Him who judgeth righteously.

FREIBERG BIBLE:—In spiritual as in corporeal things, God alone can make the crooked straight and smooth.—HARMAN (to ver. 13 f.—*Bible Reflections of a Christian*, Vol. I., p. 103):—All human wisdom labors, and has care and sorrow for its reward; the farther wisdom looks, the greater is the labyrinth in which it loses itself. It is with reason as to the eyes with a magnifying glass, when the most delicate skin becomes disgusting, the most luscious dish a mess of worms, and the finest work of art a mere botch. We see the impossibility of removing all inequalities of human society, and we see in it an overwhelming number of faults and failings; yes, the weakness of our senses and judgment leads us to find faults in beauties, because we examine all things only fragmentarily.—Vers. 16-18. HANSEN (to ver. 17):—Many thousand actions are considered prudent and wise, which in reality are silly and foolish. It is an arduous task to correct one's error in respect to all this, and regard the world, and human life in the world, with just eyes.—(To ver. 18).—Wisdom, as such, is no cause for uneasiness of mind; it is rather a cause for contentment. It sometimes happens, however, that peace of mind is disturbed by wisdom. The deeper our vision, the more clearly we perceive the imperfections among the children of men, and that usually produces unrest in the mind.—STARKE:—But because knowledge easily puffeth up (1 Cor. viii. 1), wise and learned men have so much greater need to beg God to keep them in true humility.—Every righteous teacher, yes, every true Christian, must resign himself to many evils which must meet him in the endeavor to acquire genuine wisdom.

[OLAMIC OR ÆONIAN WORDS IN SCRIPTURE—ETERNITIES OR WORLD-TIMES—CYCLICAL IDEAS IN KOHELETH.—The passage, Ecclesiastes i. 8, rendered, "the earth abideth forever," is the one most commonly quoted as their key text by those who would not only give a limited sense to עולם here, which it undoubtedly has, but would, thereby, weaken the force of this whole class of words in all other parts of the Bible, and especially when they are used in reference to a future state of being. On this account, the whole subject has seemed worthy of a fuller discussion than it has generally received in Commentaries, and this the passage to which such an exegetical

Digitized by Google

examination can be most appropriately attached.

The best rendering of the word לְעוֹלָם i. 3, is "for the world-time," or "for the world," as we have given it in the metrical version annexed. It may seem strange to ears not accustomed to it, but it is the true translation, not only here, but in many other places, where its proper significance is concealed under general or inadequate phrases. In Ecclesiastes iii. 11 it has been once rendered by our translators, "the world," which is correct enough in itself, but may mislead by raising in the reader's mind the conception of a space world. For further remarks on that important passage see note, p. 67. The word לְעוֹלָם cannot here (Eccles. i. 8) mean *for ever*, in the sense of endless duration, though it may be used for such idea when the context clearly demands, as when it is employed to denote the continuance of the Divine existence, or of the Divine Kingdom, or any thing else connected with the proper Divine eternity as the word is now taken. It is, however, in that case, only the employment of necessarily finite language to express an infinite idea strictly transcending all language, unless poorly represented by a conceptionless, negative word, which, although logically correct, is far inferior in vividness and power to some vast though finite term, which, by its very greatness and immeasurability, raises in the mind the thought of something beyond, and ever still beyond, worlds without end. This effect is still farther increased by plurals and reduplications, such as the Hebrew עלמים, and עולם עלמים, the Greek *αἰῶνες*, and *αἰῶνες τῶν αἰώνων*, the Latin *secula*, and *secula seculorum*, the old Saxon, or old English, of Wicliffe, *to worldis of worldis* (Heb. xiii. 21), or our more modern phrase, *for ever and ever*, where *ever* (German *ewig*), was originally a noun denoting age, or vast period, just like the Greek, Latin, and Hebrew words corresponding to it. Another mode of impressing the idea of absolute eternity is by the use of language in the context, or general scenic representations, which bring up the thought of *finality* in the passage, giving it the aspect of something settled, never to be disturbed, having nothing beyond that can possibly change it, as in that most impressive close of Matth. xxv. In Ecclesiastes i. 3 it evidently expresses the duration of the earth as coeval with the great order of things called the *world*, whether in the time or space sense, and vastly transcending the דור, *generation*, or *life-time* (the æon, as we might call it in a still more limited sense) of man. There is a similar contrast, Ps. xc. 1, where דור ודור "generation and generation," or "all generations," as it is rendered, refers to the human history, whilst מעולם עד עולם, from world to world, *ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος καὶ ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος*, *a seculo et usque in seculum*, *von Ewigkeit zu Ewigkeit*, refers to the Divine existence as measured, conceptually, by world times, even as our brief individual life-time is measured by years (Ps. xc. 10), and our own peculiar world-time by *dorim*, or generations.

These words correspond in all the languages referred to. They arise from a philological exigency, from the demand for some word to express that *idea* of time, or rather *conception* of time (since all language is primarily for the sense want), which goes beyond any known historical and astronomical measurements,—some great period, cycle, or age, not having its measurement from without, but in itself, or, at least, seemingly independent of outward phenomenal measurement. It is something supposed to have its own chronology, separate from other chronologies. In a lower, or more limited, sense, an olam, æon, age, world, or world-time, may be historical; that is, such indefinite periods may be regarded as coming, one after another, during the continuance of the same earth or kosmos; truly historical, yet divided from each other by some intrinsic character, rather than by mere years or centuries. Thus we say the *old world*, the *new world*, the *ancient world*, the *modern world*, the Greek world, the Roman world, &c. This would correspond to our use of the word ages, and that would make a good sense, Ecclesiastes i. 10, "the worlds or ages (עלמים) that have been before." They may also have a higher sense than the historical, regarded as the history of one earth or kosmos, continuing as it is without any great physical change. They may be cosmical æons, carrying the idea of a new dispensation, with a change in the space-kosmos with which they are connected, or some change in the human state or relation that is equally significant. It might be conceived as a decay, dissolution, and restoration,—a renewal, rather, instead of an absolute creation *de novo*. Such an idea of new cosmical worlds, or æons, is favored in a certain aspect of it by some passages of Scripture which speak of a new (or rather renewed) heavens and earth, Ps. cii. 26; Isa. lxvi. 22. Or it might be more like an idea which was certainly very ancient, of the same worlds coming over and over again, with all things and all events repeated, just as they had taken place. This was an old Egyptian and Arabian view, probably arising from the observations of astronomical cycles (see *Pareau de Notitiis Vitæ Futuræ ab antiquissimo Jobi Scriptore, etc.*, pp. 65, 66, *etc.*). Something like it was taught by Pythagoras and Plato in their doctrine of the *magnus annus*, as also by the Stoics in their doctrine of the cyclical return of the world, and all things in it, through a process of rarefaction and condensation (with a final conflagration), from which came again that rare elementary state which is in the beginning of each cycle,—a kind of thinking to which the modern nebular theories present a fair counterpart. These views of the Platonists and Stoics were sheer speculations. The old notions, however, of the Egyptians and Arabians seem to have had a different character, and as there is nothing incredible in the thought of their being known to this old writer, whether Solomon or any one else, so is it also admissible, to say the least, that some such view, in connection with others, perhaps, of a more indefinite kind, may have been included in the words of Koheleth, I., 9, 11. If some such thought had suggested the language, or been anciently suggested by it, the dogma would by no means have bound our assent, as though it were an inspired Bible truth, since it is only used by this contemplative writer as an illustration of the general cyclical notion of re-

Digitized by Google

turns in the world movement. This may be regarded almost in the light of an *a priori* idea, or one necessarily arising to every thoughtful mind in the contemplation of nature, whether we think of it as temporal or eternal. Just as the great nature is made up of lesser cycles (a thing obvious to sense), so, when viewed as a whole, and regarded simply as nature, without reference to its origin, it can only be conceived as a vast repeating cycle, having its birth, growth, increase, diminution, ortus, interitus, maxima, minima, ever going round and round, as the very law of its continued being. A straightforward movement in one direction *forever*, whether it be one of rarefaction, or condensation, of separation, or combination, must end in ruin, stagnation, death, or utter sameness, in some period far less than an absolute eternity, if we may make comparisons. To avoid this, nature, the great nature, as well as the smaller ones, must be thought of as having its *καμπή*, its *turning* or *bending*, as Plato holds, and may even be said to *demonstrate*, in the *Phædo*, 72, 73: "For if the one course of things should not give place to the other, in generation, but, on the contrary, there was ever a straightforward development (*εὐθεῖα γένεσις*) without any turning or circuit, it is certain that all things must finally get the same form (*τὸ αὐτὸ σχῆμα*), and have the same state or affection (*τὸ αὐτὸ πάθος*), and all things must cease becoming" (*παύσαι τὰ γιγνόμενα*)—that is, there would be an end of all generation; things would be brought to a stand. This would be universal death, he shows, whether an absolute immobility and stagnation, or an absolute rarefaction and incoherence, which would come to the same thing. Both terminations would be the death of nature, of all natures. Whether in the individual or the universal, it can only live by coming round and round again. This must be the law of all physical movement, whether we regard nature as eternal, or as having its great beginning, together with special beginnings, in a Divine Word. As a nature commenced, it must thus move in growth, maxima and minima, or it would not be a nature. Change, decay, death, revival, are the law of its life. ARISTOTLE thus presents the general cyclical idea (*Physica* IV. 14) as grounded in human language expressive of the natural human thinking. After speaking of time as motion in a circle, he thus proceeds: *διὰ δὲ τοῦτο καὶ τὸ εἰωθὸς λέγεσθαι συμβαίνει· φασὶ γὰρ κύκλον εἶναι τὰ ἀνθρώπινα πράγματα, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν κίνησιν ἐχόντων φυσικὴν, καὶ γένεσιν, καὶ φθοράν· ὅτί ταῦτα πάντα λαμβᾶνει τελευτὴν καὶ ἀρχὴν ὡσπερανεὶ κατά τινα περίοδον*: "On this account there arises the usual mode of speech. For they say that all *human things are a circle* (a wheel); and so of all other things that have a physical movement, both of generation and decay—namely, that they have a beginning and an end, or, as it were, a *period* (a going round)." This reminds us of the *τροχὸς γενέσεως*, "course of nature" (*circulus naturæ*), of James iii. 6, and the גִּלְגַּל תּוֹלָדוֹת "the wheel of generations," of the Talmudists and Rabbinical writers—also of Plato's splendid Myth in the Politicus (269 *c*) of the two great periods, in one of which the Divine superintendence carries nature forward in unbroken *progress*, and, in the other, it is left to itself, and, consequently, to ruin and decay. Compare also the citations made by Zöckler, p. 40, from Seneca, Tacitus, and Marcus Aurelian.

There is, however, a difference between the Greek *αἰών*, in its classical usage, and the Shemitic עולם. It consists in the fact that the latter is used for *world*—every where in the Syriac and Chaldaic, and much more frequently in the Bible Hebrew than our translation, or any modern version, would seem to show. There is a glimpse of such a meaning sometimes in the classical *αἰών*, as in ÆSCHYLUS *Supp.* 572: *Ζευς αἰῶνος κρεων ἀπαύστου*—"Zeus, king of the never ceasing (ever moving) world," as it may very appropriately be rendered, or of the never ceasing age or eternity. This world sense of the Hebrew, and of the Greek in the New Testament, does not, however, denote the world in *space*, more properly represented by the word *κοσμος*, but the world in *time*, or as a time existence. This is peculiarly a Shemitic conception, and yet it comes directly from our necessary thinking. The time of a thing enters into the idea of its true being as much as its extent or its energy in space; or, to express it more correctly, the movements *in succession*, of any true organism belong as much to its *reality* (that which makes it a *res*, or thing) as the matter or collected cotemporaneous activities to which we give the name. So, too, in our Saxon *world* (weorld), the primitive etymological conception, we think, would be found to be *time* rather than space, as appears even in the later usage which we find in such expressions as *this world* in distinction from the *other world*, or the *world to come*,—besides the already referred to usage in WICLIF's translation, where it stands for עולם in the Old Testament, and for *αἰών* in the New; as Psalm cxlv. 13 for מלכות כל עלמים *Kingdom of all worldis*, 1 Tim. i. 17 for *βασιλεὺς τῶν αἰώνων*, *Kynge of worldis*, which puts us in mind of ÆSCHYLUS, *Ζεὺς αἰῶνος κρέων ἀπαύστου*.

The only place in the Old Testament where our English translators have rendered עולם by the word *world* is Eccles. iii. 11 [see note on that passage, p. 67]. It has been objected to this by STUART, HITZIG, and others, because it is the only place, and that, therefore, the rendering is to be regarded as contrary to the usage of the language. But to this it may be replied by turning the argument: It should not have been the only place. There are others in which *world* is the best rendering. Thus in the passages already cited, Ps. xc. 2, it is literally "*from world to world*," instead of the vague term everlasting;* Ps. cxlv. 13, "kingdom of all *worlds*:" Ps. cvi. 81, 45; Jerem. x. 10, "God of life, King of the *world*;" Hab. iii. 6, הליכות עולם "goings of

* [This language is generally used of God, or His Kingdom. There are, however, cases where it is employed hyperbolically of the settlement in the promised land as in Jeremiah vii. 7: "And I will cause you to dwell in this place, which I gave to your fathers, למן עולם ועד עולם, from age to age"—or *from world to world*, or *forever*, if we take, as we may, if we have faith for it, the higher spiritual sense of the eternal settlement, the eternal rest, of which the settlement in Canaan was the appointed type.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

the world," Vulg. *itinera mundi;* Deut. xxxiii. 27, "the arms of the world"—that support the world movement. [See further on this, LANGE, *Genesis*, p. 140, *Six Days of Creation*, ch. xxvii.] From such usages came the Rabbinical sense so frequently found, and not vice versa, as some would have us believe; only that the Rabbins afterward, not fully understanding the old Hebrew conception as denoted by the plural forms of עולם, or wishing to enlarge it so as to make it a term of science, gave it also the space sense, and used it for κόσμος. (See BUXTORF—*Lex. Chald. and Rab.*). The great thought underlying all the passages just quoted is that of the world movement, as an immense time, exhibiting God's great work, or plan, Eccles. iii. 14. So also in chap. i. 8, לעולם may be rendered for the world, and, in fact, the context forces to that view: generations of men go and come, but the earth stands, לעולם, for the world-time, as long as the world lasts, conveying the same idea that is given, Ps. lxxii. 5, "throughout all generations, *as long as the sun and moon endure.*" It is a way some critics have, of refusing to see a sense in places where it occurs, and then asserting that it cannot occur in any specific instance, because "it is not found elsewhere," they say, in the Old Testament. Thus regarded, we see how it comes to be so common in the earliest Hebrew after the canonical,—not merely the earliest Rabbinical and Talmudical, but in Sirach, and other Jewish books, that much preceded them. This would never have been the case in the early Rabbinical writings, much less in these apocryphal books, had there not been some ground for it in the old Biblical Hebrew itself. And this may be said, generally, in regard to all other Rabbinisms, as they have been called, in Koheleth. They are rather Kohelethisms which appear in the earliest Rabbinical and Talmudical writers, because the old book, on account of its having more of a philosophical aspect than other ancient Scripture, possessed great charms for them, making it a favorite study, leading them to imitate its peculiar style, and to make much use of its rarer forms and words. In the apocryphal books, so far as they were written originally in Hebrew, the use of עולם for *world*, or *world time*, is beyond all reasonable doubt. It must have been so employed in Sirach xxxvi. 17, where we have the Greek αἰῶνας in the *world* sense, as also in Tobit xiii. 6, 10. In both cases the language is precisely similar to that Ps. cxlv. 13 and 1 Tim. i. 17. The earliest Syriac preceding the New Testament used their emphatic form of the word [עלמא] in the same way, as appears from the Peschito version of the Old Testament, as well as that of the New, this same word being used in such passages as Ps. xc. 2, cxlv. 13, Ecclesiastes iii. 11, and Hebrews i. 3, xi. 3, as a rendering of αἰών, αἰῶνες, where the Greek has, beyond all doubt, the *world* sense, though in its time aspect. Again, there is no accounting for this idiom in the New Testament [this use of αἰών so different from the classical] except by regarding it as a Hebraism, which is simply saying that the world sense, thus viewed, was an old and established sense of the Hebrew עולם. There was nothing in any science, or thinking, in the Jewish age immediately preceding, to occasion any change or departure from the old meaning. There is neither authority nor weight in WINER's remarks (*Idioms of New Testament*, § 27, 3) on the plural forms of αἰών,—that "they are used for *worlds* because the object denoted consists of several parts, *e. g.*, οἱ αἰῶνες, the whole world, the universe," with which he would compare the Rabbinical use of עלמים "The Jews," he says, "imagined several heavens, one above the other." That is true, but they never use עלמים to express such a conception. It is ever שמי שמים, the Heaven of Heavens, or the Heaven and Heaven of Heavens, or some similar language, from which came afterwards the *third heaven* of the Jews, and the seven heavens of the Talmud and of the Mohammedans. But this was ever in the space sense—*worlds above worlds*—not the time sense, *worlds after worlds*, which was a conception peculiarly Shemitic, barely found, if at all, among other ancient peoples, and giving rise to those *pluralities* of עולם, and afterwards of αἰών, which can be accounted for in no other way; since the conception of absolute endlessness as etymological in עולם, or αἰών, would clearly have prevented it. It is this idea which so refutes the assertion of STUART (*Comment.* Ecclesiastes xii. 1) that "time divided is not strictly predicable of a future state." He means that all duration before or after the present *world*, as we call it, must be regarded as one continuous blank, or unvaried extension of being. There are not only no days and years, such as measure our olam, but no αἰῶνες, or world-times, in that greater chronology. This certainly is not the Scripture mode of conception, or such language as we find would never have arisen, or such pluralities as עלמים, αἰῶνες, or their reduplications, ages of ages, worlds of worlds exactly like the space pluralities שמי שמים, heaven of heavens. Such is the Scripture conception, we say, and what right had STUART, following HITZIG, to deny that it is a Scripture truth, or to affirm that it is only a mode of speaking *more humano?* And reason sanctions it. What a narrow idea that the great antepast, and the great future after this brief world or עולם has passed away, are to be regarded as having no chronology of a higher kind, no other worlds, and worlds of worlds, succeeding each other in number and variety inconceivable! ROBINSON seems to hold the view of WINER that when αἰῶνες is used for worlds in the New Testament, it is to be regarded as a space conception, "the upper and lower worlds, the heavens and the earth, as making up the universe;" and he refers to Heb. i. 2 and xi. 3, passages which should have convinced him (*pace tanti viri*, do we venture to say it) that the time sense (worlds *after* worlds instead of worlds *beyond* or *above* worlds) is not only predominant but exclusive, as it is in 1 Timothy i. 17, βασιλεὺς τῶν αἰώνων, the King of the worlds, the *King eternal.* This would seem, too, to be ZÖCKLER's way of thinking, when he speaks of the rendering world (Eccles. iii. 11) as appearing first in the Talmudic literature, and

Digitized by Google

carrying the sense of kosmos, macrocosmos. Neither עולם in the Old Testament, nor *αἰών* in the New, has ever the sense of kosmos, or any space conception attached to it. That idea, as was said before, did come in afterwards among the Talmudists and early Rabbins, but it was only after they had got a smattering of science, and wished to make some of their old words look more philosophical. See BUXTORF's *Lexicon* on the word. They still, however, retained the time sense, or the world-time, in their favorite expressions, עולם הזה *this world*, and עולם הבא, the *world to come*, which are exact representations of the ancient usage, as it arose in that early day, when *time worlds* were so much more a source of wondering thought than *worlds in space*, the boasted conception of our modern knowledge.

It may be thought that this view of עולם and *αἰών* as having plurals, and, therefore, not in themselves denoting absolute endlessness, or infinity of time, must weaken the force of certain passages in the New Testament, especially of that most solemn sentence, Matth. xxv. 46. This, however, comes from a wrong view of what constitutes the real power of the impressive language there employed. The preacher, in contending with the Universalist, or Restorationist, would commit an error, and, it may be, suffer a failure in his argument, should he lay the whole stress of it on the etymological or historical significance of the words, *αἰών*, *αἰωνίος*, and attempt to prove that, of themselves, they necessarily carry the meaning of endless duration. There is another method by which the conclusion is reached in a much more impressive and cavil-silencing manner. It is by insisting on that dread aspect of *finality* that appears not in single words merely, but in the power and vividness of the language taken as a whole. The parabolic images evidently represent a *closing scene*. It is the *last* great act in the drama of human existence, the human *world*, or æon, we may say, if not the cosmical. It is the *συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος*, Matth. xiii. 39, the *end*, the *settlement*, the *reckoning* of the world, or more strongly, Heb. ix. 26, *συντέλεια τῶν αἰώνων*, "the settlement of the worlds," when "God demands again the ages fled," Eccles. iii. 15 (see the Metrical Version, and the reasons for this translation). At all events, our race, the בני אדם, the Adamic race, the human *αἰών*, or world, is judged; whether that judgment occupy a solar day of twenty-four hours, or a much longer historic period. There comes at last the end. Sentence is pronounced. The condemned go away, *εἰς κόλασιν αἰώνιον*—the righteous, *εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον*. Both states are expressed in language precisely parallel, and so presented that we cannot exegetically make any difference in the force and extent of the terms. *Αἰώνιος*, from its adjective form, may perhaps mean, an existence, a duration, measured by æons, or worlds (taken as the measuring unit), just as our present world, or æon, is measured by years or centuries. But it would be more in accordance with the plainest etymological usage to give it simply the sense of *olamic* or *æonic*, or to regard it as denoting, like the Jewish עולם הבא (*olam habba*), the *world to come*. These shall go away into the punishment [the restraint, imprisonment] of the world to come, and these into the life of the world to come. That is all we can etymologically or exegetically make of the word in this passage. And so is it ever in the old Syriac Version, where the one rendering is still more unmistakably clear: "These shall go away לְתַשְׁנִיקָא דַלְעָלַם to the pain of the olam, and these לְחַיֵּא דַלְעָלַם to the life of the olam"—the world to come. Compare the same Syriac expressions in a great many other passages, such as Matth. xix. 16; Mark x. 17; Luke xviii. 18; John iii. 15; Acts xiii. 46; 1 Tim. vi. 12, *etc.*, in which *αἰώνιος* is ever rendered דַלְעָלַם or דַלְעָלְכָא (more emphatic) "that which belongs to the olam," in the singular.

They shall go away—the one here, the other there. The two classes so long mingled are divided, *no more*, as it would seem, to be again together. The "wheat is gathered into the garner," the "tares are cast into the fire." The harvest is over; there is no more to follow; at least, the language gives us no intimation of any thing beyond. The catastrophe has come; the drama is ended; the curtain drops. Shall it never rise again? Is this solemn close forever in the sense of irreversibility? Who is authorized to say that there will ever be an arrest of this judgment, or a new trial ever granted? Every thing in the awful scene so graphically depicted seems to favor the one thought of *finality*. Rash minds may indulge the thought of some change, some dispensation in still remoter "worlds to come," but there is no warrant for it in any of the language employed. If there be allowed the thought of change, it may be inferred of the one state as well as of the other. The *ζωὴ αἰώνιος* may have its interruption, its renewed probation, and exposure to evil; exegetically this may be as well sustained as the other. To rebut any such presumption, we have, too, our Saviour's words, John xiv. 2: "If it were not so, I would have told you." There would have been a similar ground for such language here as when he said, "Let not your hearts be troubled; in my Father's house are many mansions;" there would have been the same reason for allaying fears of change on the one hand, or preventing despair on the other, had there not been the intention to impress that thought of finality which the whole dramatic representation so vividly conveys: If there were ages of change coming somewhere in the vast future, in the infinite flow of the *αἰῶνες τῶν αἰώνων*, "the ages of ages," when the *ζωὴ* should cease, or the *κόλασις* be intermitted, "I would have told you." He has not told us; and no man should have the audacity to raise the veil which He has so solemnly dropped before the vision both of sense and reason. Let it remain for a new revelation, when he chooses to make it. Till then it stands: They shall go away, the one into the life, the other into the imprisonment, of *the world to come*. There is no more; let no one add to it; let no one take away.

Some have thought to find the metaphysical idea of *timelessness* in the Scriptural olamic words, and especially in the *αἰών*, *αἰώνιος*, of the New

Digitized by Google

Testament. That is a Platonic notion largely dwelt upon in the Timæus (37 *c*) where *αἰών* is represented as fixed, one of the "things that stand" [belonging to the class called *τὰ ὄντα* rather than *τὰ γιγνόμενα*] whilst *χρόνος*, *flowing time*, is its "moving image," or the revolving mirror which seems to set in motion the landscape of eternity, though, in reality, all is changeless and still. But this timeless idea is no etymological sense of *αἰών*; it is only the speculative notion of the philosopher which he represents by the word as supplying a supposed antithesis to *χρόνος*, *time*. We have no right to say, however, that there is no ground for it in the reason. It appears, sometimes, in the common thinking, as when we speak of time as contrasted with eternity, or of a state before time was, or that shall be when "time shall be no more." Such a style of speech has been favored by a wrong interpretation of the language, Rev. x. 6, *ὅτι χρόνος οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι*, and a severing it from its immediate context. Still its prevalence shows that it is not altogether alien to the human thinking. It is felt that there is a solid reason for predicating timelessness of God, of the Divine mind, and the Divine ways, as lying above the plane of the human, even "as the Heaven is high above the earth" [Isa. lv. 9]. To Deity all effects must be present in their causes, and causes seen in their effects, and all phenomena, or "things that do appear," must have their more real existence in the unseen seminal energies of which they are manifestations. They have their true being in the Logos or Word from whence they came. In this sense the Prophet most sublimely represents God as יֹשֵׁב קֶדֶם, Ps. lv. 20, *sedens antiquitatem*, literally, sitting the everlasting antepast, and שֹׁכֵן עַד Isa. lvii. 15, *inhabiting eternity*, both of which expressions would seem to aim at denoting, as far as language can denote it, a timeless state, as opposed to movement or succession. And so even in regard to the human soul, our own finite thoughts may sometimes faintly present to us the image of successionless spiritual being, or of some approach to it. We can think of a condition of the spirit in which time, as movement, seems to disappear. It may be the conception of some "beatific vision" on the one hand, or of some "horror of great darkness" on the other, the one so enrapturing and absorbing, the other so dense and harrowing, that all division, or sense of such division, seems so wholly lost that existence, in this respect, may not improperly be said to be timeless. Again, there is the schoolmen's notion of eternity as given by Boethius, *tota simul et interminabilis vitæ possessio*, or as it is defined by that quaint old Hebraist and Lexicographer, Robertson—"Eternity the everlasting and ever present, without futurition or preterition," as in the timeless name אהיה, יהיה, the I AM (Jahveh or Jehovah) *ὁ ὢν, καὶ ὁ ἦν, καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος*. But such a timeless idea is hardly for our present thinking, in this present state of change and transition. "Such knowledge is too wonderful for us; it is high, we cannot attain unto it." The mere glimpse we sometimes get dazzles the vision, and casts us down to that mode of thinking, as necessarily involving succession, which God has made the law of our present mental being. We cannot, therefore, believe that this timeless idea of *αἰών* is intended in those passages that are meant to impress us with the solemnities of our future existence. If it thus occurs any where in the New Testament, it would seem to be in such passages as 2 Cor. iv. 18, *τὰ γὰρ βλεπόμενα πρόσκαιρα, τὰ δὲ μὴ βλεπόμενα αἰώνια*—"the things that are *seen* are *temporal*, the things that are *unseen* are *eternal*." We do not think that Paul got this, or other passages like it (such as Heb. xi. 1, 3; Rom. i. 20) from Plato, or that they were suggested to him by any study of the Platonic writings; but certainly there is a wonderful resemblance between it and some things in the Timæus, and the Republic. The *μὴ βλεπόμενα*, the *ἀόρατα*, "the *unseen* things," of Paul, do strongly suggest, and are suggested by the *ἀειδῆ*, the *ἀόρατα*, the *νοητὰ* of Plato, as all denoting, not merely things absent from present vision, but that which is, in its very essence, unseen, supersensual, above all the senses, for which seeing is simply taken as the higher and general representative. So *πρόσκαιρα* and *αἰώνια* suggest the same distinction that Plato makes in the Timæus between the *γιγνόμενα*, and the *αἰώνια*, the *becoming*, the flowing, the changing, and the æonian, in the sense of reality and immutability. We are strongly drawn to think that Paul has something of the same contrast, though presented in a far higher and holier aspect than the mere philosophical contemplation. *Πρόσκαιρα*, *temporal* would seem opposed to *αἰώνια*, not in the sense of a short period (or periods) as contrasted with a long duration, or even an endless duration, but, rather, as time itself, or existence in time, as the antithesis of the timeless, that *immutable*, successionless being which even now we sometimes seem to see as in a mirror shadowly, (1 Cor. xiii. 12), or enigmatically, but which then the soul may behold, face to face, as the most real of all realities. Except, however, in such lofty passages as that, where the inspired writer seems to see, and strives to utter, things *ἄῤῥητα*, or ineffable (2 Cor. xii. 4), it is best to be content with that other and more obvious sense, which is best adapted to our faculties in their present state, and which may, therefore, be rationally regarded as the sense intended for us by the divine author of the Scriptures. Even here, in 2 Cor. iv. 18, this lower sense, if any choose to call it so, satisfies every demand of our present thinking: the things that are seen, the changing transitory objects around us, belong to our present transitory being—they are *πρόσκαιρα*, for a season.—The things that "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard," belong to the great *world to come*, as an advanced period in the vast successions of time. In this sense they are olamic or æonian. A purely timeless state, it may be said, is above our *conceptions*, at least for the human or finite existence,—above our conceptual thinking even, though not altogether transcending, as an *idea*, our highest reasoning.

There are other passages in which the sense of עולם would seem even more limited than in this verse of Ecclesiastes (i. 3), or rather, to be taken as a hyperbolical term for the indefinite or unmeasured, though of conceivably short duration. Compare Exod. xxi. 16, where it is said

Digitized by Google

of a servant in certain cases ויעבדו לעולם, "and he shall serve him *forever*"—that is, in distinction from a *set time*. So also, Lev. xxv. 26. The same language is used of inheritances, and earthly possessions, as in Deut. xxix. 28. As an example of the immense extremes which the context shows in the use of the word, compare the language employed but a short distance from this latter passage, Deut. xxxii. 40 חי אני לעולם "*I live forever*," spoken of God in such a way as to mean nothing less than the absolute or endless eternity. But it is the subject to which it is applied that forces to this, not any etymological necessity in the word itself.

"And they shall reign *forever and forever*," Rev. xxii. 5. Here is another example of an attempt to express the immeasurable, though in a different way, that is, by reduplications: *καὶ βασιλεύσουσιν εἰς τοὺς* ΑΙΩΝΑΣ *τῶν* ΑΙΩΝΩΝ, in *secula seculorum*, לעולם עלמים, Syriac לְעָלְמֵא דְעָלְמֵא, or, in one word, לְעָלְכְּעָלְמִין, *leolam olemin*, *for-ever-ever-more*, for ages of ages, worlds of worlds, eternities of eternities.—WICKLIFF, "*thei schulen regne in to worldis of worldis*." It falls short, of course, in *conception*, as all language must, yet still it is conceptually aiming at the endless, or absolute eternity, and must be taken, therefore, as representative of it in *idea*. A negative term, in such case, like *infinite*, or *endless*, might have been used; but though correct, logically, it would have had far less conceptual, or even ideal power.

This is said of the future. There is a similar language used of the past; as Ephesians iii. 9, *ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων*, *a seculis*, מן עולמים, from the olams, from the ages, the eternities, WICLIFFE, "*hidde fro worldis*," TYNDALE, "from the beginning of the world," the great world, including all worlds,—or, taken without division, the antepast eternity, before the present *αἰών*, *olam*, or world, began.

There is another method in which an attempt is made to represent the absolute eternity. It is by a phrase shorter than those before mentioned, but more emphatic, and, in some respects, more impressive. It is by adding to עולם, or to לעולם, the particle עַד, or the noun עַד, sometimes written עֲד. FUERST makes this word, as a noun, denoting eternity, from a supposed root עד, to which he gives the sense *obducere*, *obvelare*, to conceal, &c., making it, in this way, like the verb עלם, the primary sense of which is *hiddenness*, *obscurity*, thus giving the noun עולם the sense of the unbounded, the indefinite. There is no authority for this in the case of עד. It might more plausibly be regarded as having the sense of number, like the Arabic عَدَّ; but the best view is that of GESENIUS, who makes it, both as noun and particle, from עדה = Arabic عدا which has the sense of *transition*. It is rather *transition to*, *arrival* and going *beyond*—a passing beyond, still farther, on, and on. Thus it becomes a name for eternity, as in those remarkable expressions, Isa. ix. 5, אֲבִי עַד, poorly rendered *everlasting Father*, and שֹׁכֵן עַד, *inhabiting eternity*, Isa. lvii. 15; with which compare הַרְרֵי עַד Hab. iii. 6, הוֹרַי עַד, Gen. xlix. 29, and עַד עוֹלְמֵי עַד, Isa. xlv. 17, where we have the same word as noun and preposition—the mountains of *ad*, the progenitors of *ad*—*to* the ages of *ad*—*to* the ages *to* which other ages are to be added, indefinitely. Hence the preposition sense *to*, making it significantly, as well as etymologically equivalent to the Latin *ad et*, the Greek *ἔτι*, Saxon *at* and *to*, in all of which there is this sense of *arrival* and *transition*. The idea becomes most vivid and impressive in this Hebrew phrase לְעוֹלָם וָעֶד, for ever and *yet*, for the age, the world, the eternity, and still on, on, on; or as the quaint old lexicographer before referred to expresses it, "it imparteth this, *As yet, and as yet, and ever as yet, forever, and* forevermore, as yet"—as though there were, in this short word thus added to עולם, the full power of Handel's Hallelujah Chorus, as it comes to us in the seemingly endless repetitions of that most sublime music. Unlike the others, the effect of this short addition to עולם is felt, in its very brevity and abruptness, as something that gives the impression of endless iteration. It is like the mathematician's abbreviating term + &c., or the sign of infinity ∞, or the symbol by which he would denote the supposed last term of an infinite series. These pluralities and reduplications, and other striking methods of representing the olamic ideas, are peculiar to the Shemitic languages, or they appear in our modern tongues only as derived from them through Bible translations, much changed, too, and weakened in the transfer. They are utterly at war with the thought of the great eternal past and future as blank undivided durations, according to the unwarranted dictum of HITZIG and STUART, which would confine all history and all chronology to this brief æon we call time. These peculiar terms, with their strange pluralities, would never have grown up in the language of a people who entertained such a blank conception. The fact, however, is just the other way. In these vast time ideas, and the manner of vividly representing them, the Shemitic mind went beyond the modern, although we boast, and with reason, of so far exceeding the early men in the vastness of our space conceptions. It is only lately that our science has had its attention called to the great time periods of the world, as transcending the ordinary historical. Under the influence of the new idea, we talk largely in our numerical estimates, though almost wholly hypothetical; but for real emotional power what are our long rows of decimals, our myriads, and millions, and billions, to the *αἰῶνες τῶν αἰώνων*, the ages of ages, the *worldis of worldis*, the olam of olams, the great world made up of countless worlds, not *beyond each other*, in space, but *one after the other*, in time?

There is still another aspect of the world idea, which seems to be presented, Ecclesiastes iii. 11,

Digitized by Google

14. The thought of the world, or of a world, when the mind receives it complete, comes to it in a trinal form of contemplation, like the three dimensions in geometry, breadth, length, and height. It is the world in space and force, (or the world dynamically), the world in time, and the world in rank or range of being. To use some of the language employed by Dr. Lange, *Genesis*, 190, 191, it is the "world as *kosmos*, the world as *æon*," to which we may add, the world as the kingdom of God. The application of this thought, especially the latter view of it, to Ecclesiastes iii. 11, 14, gives those verses a force and significance which warrants great confidence in it as the true interpretation. On ver. 11 of that chapter, see some further remarks in the note adjoined. In ver. 14 it is said, "I know that all that God doeth," or "whatsoever God doeth, it shall be *forever*," says our translation, *in perpetuum* says the *Vulgate*, lxx. *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* (for the *æon*), Luther, *das bestehet immer*. The Hebrew לְעוֹלָם here may be rendered, as in ver. 11, *for the world*, but it can hardly be regarded exclusively, or mainly, as either the world in space or the world in time. The mind is not satisfied with the rendering *forever*, or *for eternity*, if there is understood by it simply endless duration. God's greater works, the heavenly bodies and their motions may have such a term applied to them, hyperbolically, as compared with the transient works of man, and this is the view which some excellent commentators take of the passage. There is a striking resemblance to it, well worthy of note, in Cicero's Treatise *de Natura Deorum*, where the lower tellurian irregularities are contrasted with the heavenly order and permanency as manifested in the planetary movements, or, to use some of Kohheleth's language, the flowing, changing world, תַּחַת הַשָּׁמֶשׁ, "beneath the sun," and the world *supra solem*, the eternal sphere, unchanging, or forever constant, in its one unvarying movement: *Nulla igitur in cælo nec fortuna, nec temeritas, nec erratio, nec varietas inest; contraque, omnis ORDO, VERITAS, RATIO, CONCORDIA; quæque his vacant, ementita et falsa, plenaque erroris, ea circum terras, infra lunam, quæ omnium ultima est, in terrisque versantur.* "There is, therefore, in the heavens neither chance, nor arbitrariness, nor erroneous movement, nor variableness, but, on the contrary, all is *order, truth, reason, constancy* (ratio in the sense of proportion, harmony); void of these, all is spurious, false, full of error, that lies *beneath the moon*, the lowest sphere, or that has its home here on earth" [Argument of the Stoic Balbus, Cic. *De. Nat. Deor.*, II. 22]." "Beneath the moon"—compare it with the frequent Solomonic expression above referred to, and the sublime language, Job xxv. 2, עֹשֶׂה שָׁלוֹם בִּמְרוֹמָיו *faciens concordiam in sublimibus suis*—"who maketh peace in His high places." Thus regarded, the heavens in their larger and higher aspect, are representative of the calmness, immutability, and unfailing certainty of that divine Will which is ever one with the divine Reason. This is indeed a noble view of the passage, but we cannot think it the exclusively true one, not simply because it is said in other Scriptures (Ps. cii. 26, Isa. li. 6), that "the heavens themselves grow old" and "vanish away," but because it can hardly be made to suit with the expression לְעוֹלָם, either in its cosmical or time sense, or those other words כל אשר "whatsoever God has made." Some things God has made to be transient, and they can, in no sense, be said to "be *forever*," or "for eternity," unless we take it, according to the view of Zöckler, in their connections with other things that are eternal, or in their bearing upon eternal destinies. But this would be true also of the works and movements of man, or things "beneath the sun." The better view, therefore, and better satisfying the whole spirit of the passage, is that which regards עוֹלָם as denoting the *world*, or *world-time* in God's sight—the great ideal, as it appears to Him, including not merely space and time, but the great *range of being*—or, to avoid the use of what might seem affected philosophical language, the divine plan of being, to which the smallest and most transient things contribute as well as the greatest,—in other words, the kingdom of God. To this "nothing can be added; from it nothing can be taken away." In this sense, all that God doeth is לְעוֹלָם, for the olam, for the *world*, for the great whole of being, as distinguished from the human plans, the human doings, with their adapted yet transient seasons, as they are enumerated in the first part of the chapter—"a time for *every thing*," but every thing for the olam, or great *world time*, with its inconceivable range of being, transcending man, as man transcends the animal *worlds* below him. A somewhat similar view seems to have been entertained by that excellent old commentator Martin Geier. He refers it to "the divine decrees"—God's ideal world, in fact, whose effects are determined in their causes, as the causes are all contained in the effects. "By God's doing here" he says, "we are not to understand simply the things produced by him, creatures which God has made; for they do not all remain forever, &c., but it is to be understood, *de facere Dei interno, i. e., de decretis divinis*, of the divine decrees (*in mente divina*) as they are forever in the divine mind, unchangeably, without addition or diminution, *nam consilium Jehovah in seculum stat, cogitationes cordis ejus in generationem et generationem*, Ps. xxxiii. 11: "For the counsel of Jehovah *stands*, the thoughts of his heart unto all generations." See also the note on the astronomical objections to the Bible; *Bibelwerk, Genesis, Eng. ed.*, pp. 183, 184.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

B.—The practical wisdom of men, aiming at sensual enjoyment, and magnificent worldly enterprises, is vanity.

CHAPTER II. 1–26.

1. The vanity of practical wisdom in itself, proved by the example of Solomon.

(VERS. 1–19).

1 I said in mine heart, Go to now, I will prove thee with mirth, therefore enjoy
2 pleasure: and behold, this also *is* vanity. I said of laughter, *It is* mad; and of
3 mirth, What doeth *it?* I sought in mine heart to give myself unto wine, yet ac-
quainting mine heart with wisdom; and to lay hold on folly, till I might see what
was that good for the sons of men, which they should do under the heaven all the
4 days of their life. I made me great works; I builded me houses; I planted me
5 vineyards: I made me gardens and orchards, and I planted trees in them of all
6 *kind of* fruits. I made me pools of water, to water therewith the wood that bring-
7 eth forth trees: I got *me* servants and maidens, and had servants born in my house;
also I had great possessions of great and small cattle above all that were in Jeru-
8 salem before me: I gathered me also silver and gold, and the peculiar treasure of
kings, and of the provinces: I gat me men-singers and women-singers, and the de-
9 lights of the sons of men, *as* musical instruments, and that of all sorts. So I was
great, and increased more than all that were before me in Jerusalem: also my wis-
10 dom remained with me. And whatsoever mine eyes desired I kept not from them,
I withheld not my heart from any joy; for my heart rejoiced in all my labour:
11 and this was my portion of all my labour. Then I looked on all the works that
my hands had wrought, and on the labour that I had laboured to do: and behold,
12 all *was* vanity and vexation of spirit, and *there was* no profit under the sun. And
I turned myself to behold wisdom, and madness, and folly: for what *can* the man
13 *do* that cometh after the king? *even* that which hath been already done. Then I
14 saw that wisdom excelleth folly, as far as light excelleth darkness. The wise man's
eyes *are* in his head; but the fool walketh in darkness: and I myself perceived also
15 that one event happeneth to them all. Then said I in my heart, As it happeneth
to the fool, so it happeneth even to me; and why was I then more wise? Then I
16 said in my heart, that this also *is* vanity. For *there is* no remembrance of the wise
more than of the fool for ever; seeing that which now *is*, in the days to come shall
17 all be forgotten. And how dieth the wise *man?* as the fool. Therefore I hated
life; because the work that is wrought under the sun *is* grievous unto me: for all
18 *is* vanity and vexation of spirit. Yea, I hated all my labour which I had taken
under the sun; because I should leave it unto the man that shall be after me.
19 And who knoweth whether he shall be a wise *man* or a fool? yet shall he have rule
over all my labour wherein I have laboured, and wherein I have shewed myself
wise under the sun. This *is* also vanity.

2. The aim of life to be attained in consideration of the empirical vanity of practical wisdom.

VERS. 20–26.

20 Therefore I went about to cause my heart to despair of all the labour which I
21 took under the sun. For there is a man whose labour is in wisdom, and in know-
ledge, and in equity; yet to a man that hath not laboured therein shall he leave
22 it *for* his portion. This also *is* vanity and a great evil. For what hath man of

Digitized by Google

all his labour, and of the vexation of his heart, wherein he hath laboured under
23 the sun? For all his days *are* sorrow, and his travail grief; yea, his heart taketh
24 not rest in the night. This is also vanity. *There is* nothing better for a man than
that he should eat and drink, and *that* he should make his soul enjoy good in his
25 labour. This also I saw, that it *was* from the hand of God. For who can eat, or
26 who else can hasten *hereunto* more than I? For *God* giveth to a man that *is* good
in his sight wisdom, and knowledge, and joy: but to the sinner he giveth travail,
to gather and to heap up, that he may give to *him that is* good before God. This
also *is* vanity and vexation of spirit.

[Ver. 1.—נָא. A particle of address or appeal, *come on now*, sometimes of entreaty. Here it denotes another trial with an ironical intimation of its failure. The address is to his heart, and the strong entreaty, or emotion, is shown in the paragogic ה in אנסכה. *O let me try thee again!*—T. L.]

[Ver. 3.—לִכְשׁוֹךְ—הָרְתִי. See EXEGET. and Notes. מִסְפָּר is sometimes used to denote paucity, as Numb. ix. 20; Gen. xxxiv. 30; Ps cv. 12, &c. Here the whole phrase may be rendered *numbered days*, *i. e*, few days. See Metrical Version.—T. L.]

[Ver. 5.—פַּרְדֵּסִים. See EXEGET and note to Introduction, p. 32.—T. L.]

[Ver. 8.—כְּדִינוֹת. *Int. Ap.*, p. 34, שִׁדָּה, שִׁדּוֹת. See EXEGET. and Note; also *Int.* to *Metrical Version.*—T. L.]

[Ver. 10.—אָצַלְתִּי rendered *denied*, but more properly *withhold* from, primary sense to *separate*, *place by itself*, Gen. xxvii. 36.—T. L.]

[Ver. 13.—רָאִיתִי denotes more properly here the *judgment* of the mind than seeing stated as a fact. I *thought*, I *judged*. Such a sense is a very common one in the Arabic root, and in the Rabbinical usage. It occurs also in the oldest Hebrew, as in the language Gen. ii. 19, "He brought them unto Adam," לִרְאוֹת, for Adam to *see* (*judge*) what name he should give them. It is only an *opinion* expressed here. See *Metrical Version.*—T. L.]

[Ver. 14.—מִקְרֶה. See EXEGET. and Note, p. 58—T. L.]

[Ver. 16.—בְּשֶׁכְּבָר. The full form would be בַּאֲשֶׁר כְּבָר. For an examination of such words, and the manner in which they have become abbreviated, whether in later or earlier Hebrew, or as a mere matter of orthography, see text note to Gen. vi. 3 [בְּשַׁגַּם].—T. L.]

[Ver. 20.—וְסַבּוֹתִי. See EXEGET. and Note.—T. L.]

[Ver. 21.—כִּשְׁרוֹן. One of the words relied upon to prove the late date; but it is most purely Hebrew, and a noun of the same root, and the same sense, is found in that old composition Ps. lxviii. 7: כּוֹשָׁרָה *prosperity*, very wrongly rendered *chains* in E. V., as though from קֶשֶׁר. See HUPFELD.—T. L.]

[Ver. 24.—שֶׁיֹּאכַל. See EXEGET. and Note.—T. L.]

[Ver. 25.—יָחוּשׁ חוּץ. Literally *hasten beyond*, go farther—*more without*. There is the figure of a race. See Metrical Version; also the EXEGET. and Note, p. 55—T. L.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Of the two divisions of this chapter, the *first*, (vers. 1–19), treats of the vanity of the practical efforts of men, and thus supplements the description of the vanity of the theoretical strivings after wisdom, whilst the *second* division (vers. 20-26) is of a more general character, and deduces a provisional result from the nature of human strivings after wisdom as therein set forth. Each of the two divisions contains two subdivisions or strophes within itself, of which, naturally, that of the first longer division (the one of nine, the other of eight verses) is especially comprehensive, and is, in addition to this, provided with a short introductory proposition (vers. 1, 2). The complete scheme of the contents of this chapter is therefore as follows:—I. *Division.* The vanity of practical wisdom aiming at sensual enjoyment and magnificent enterprises, proved by the example of Solomon: a. (proposition, vers. 1, 2), in general; b. (*first* strophe, vers. 3–11), in reference to that seeking after enjoyment and extensive activity; c. (*second strophe*, vers. 12-19) in reference to the uncertain and deceptive success of the efforts alluded to.—II. *Division:* The aim of life to be attained in consideration of the empirical vanity of practical wisdom; a. (*first* strophe, vers. 20-23): Negative proof of the same, as not consisting in grasping after earthly and selfish wisdom, and after external worldly success; b. (*second* strophe, vers. 24-26): Positive showing of the life aim of the wise man, as consisting in the cheerful enjoyment of worldly benefits offered by God to those in whom he delights.

2. *First Division. Proposition or general Introduction:* Vers. 1, 2.—**I said in my heart.** אֲנִי with אָמַרְתִּי is essentially pleonastic, as also in i. 16; ii. 11, 14, 18; iii. 17, *etc.*, for it is in no wise apparent that a special significance is in these passages to be given to the subject speaking (HENGSTENBERG), and pleonasms of all varieties are very characteristic in the somewhat broad and circumstantial style of the author. *Go to now, I will prove thee with mirth, i. e.*, I will try whether thou wilt feel contented and happy in this new object of thy experience, namely, in cheerful sensual enjoyment, whether, on this path of pleasure and joy thou canst become a לֵב טוֹב (chap. ix. 7). For the address to his own heart (or own soul) comp. Ps. xvi. 2; xlii. 5; xliii. 5; Luke xii. 18, 19; for the construction, to prove one with something (נִסָּה בְּ), 1 Kings, x. 1.—**Therefore enjoy**

Digitized by Google

pleasure. (*Lit. Ger.*, behold pleasure). — This beholding is here considered as connected with an enjoyable appropriation of the object beheld, which sense the preposition strongly expresses by virtue of its reference to the conception of lingering with the beheld object; comp. רָאָה בְּ in Gen. xxi. 16; Job. iii. 9; and therewith the simple רָאָה in the expression רָאָה טוֹבָה Eccles. vi. 6, or in רְאֵה חַיִּים, chap. ix. and in רָאָה שֵׁנָה, chap. viii. 16, *etc.* Ver. 2. **I said of laughter, It is mad.** "Of laughter," does not mean as much as "in reference to laughter" (KNOBEL, VAIH., *etc*): but the laughter, *i. e.*, the unrestrained cheerfulness attending sensual enjoyment, seems here to be personified, just as mirth in the next clause. מְהוֹלָל, *Part. Poal*, as in Ps. cii. 9, means really one void of sense, one infatuated, and might more properly be considered masculine, than as neuter (with VAIH., HITZIG, *etc.*), so that LUTHER's translation: "Thou art mad," apart from the address, seems substantially justified. See HENGSTENBERG, who strikingly compares with it ἄφρον, Luke xii. 20, and justly finds in this passage the germ of the Parable of the Rich Man, Luke xii. 16-21. **And of mirth, what doeth it?** *i. e.*, what does it accomplish, what fruit does it bring forth (comp. עָשָׂה פְּרִי)? Luther, in imitation of the *Sept. Vulg.*, *etc.*, considers the question as an address to mirth ("what doest thou)?" but it is rather, as the word זֹה shows, a bitterly contemptuous exclamation addressed to some third person, and an answer is not expected. For the form זֹה instead of זֹאת comp. v. 15; vii. 23, Kings vi. 19. Some exegetists, especially of the rationalistic period, have unjustly desired to find a contradiction in the fact that KOHELETH here despises cheerful sensual enjoyment, whilst in conclusion (ver. 24, f.) he vaunts it as the principal aim of life.* What he here blames and condemns as foolish, is clearly only that empty merriment which accompanies the wild exhilaration of sensual enjoyment, or sensual pleasure, as only end and aim of human effort, not a thankfully cheerful enjoyment of the benefits bestowed by God. Comp. LUTHER on this passage, and see the homiletical hints.

3. *First division, first strophe:* Vers. 3-11.—**I sought in mine heart to give myself unto wine.** (*Lit. Ger.*, to comfort my flesh with wine). Of the sensual joy indicated in the first verse, a special kind is here named, by which the preacher first sought to obtain satisfaction, and then follow, to the sixth verse inclusive, still other such separate means of sensual enjoyment. The word תַּרְתִּי, therefore, recommences the account where the אֲנַסְּכָה ver. 1, had begun it, and is in substance synonymous with that verb. Comp. Numb. xiii. 18; xv. 39; *etc.*, where תּוּר is always used in the sense of trying, experimenting, and not in that of thinking, reflecting. (ELSTER). מָשַׁךְ בָּשָׂר is most justly explained by GESENIUS, HITZIG, HENGSTENBERG, *etc.*, as "to nourish the body," *i. e.*, to keep it in action or condition, to make it lasting and strong, so that the expression: "bread which strengtheneth man's heart" (Ps. civ. 15), seems parallel with it. Others explain it differently, as KNOBEL and VAIHINGER: "To keep my sensual nature with wine;" EWALD, ELSTER: "to attach my sense to wine;" HERZFELD: "to entice my body by wine," *etc.* **Yet acquainting mine heart with wisdom.** (*Lit. Ger.*, my heart led me with wisdom), a parenthetical clause that clearly indicates what the inner man of the preacher did whilst his flesh rioted in pleasures and enjoyments. The sense is therefore: I did not plunge headlong into coarse, fleshly gratifications, but, true to the warning counsel in Prov. xxxi. 4, f., I tested with calm reflection, and in a composed way, whether real contentment was to be secured by means of sensual joys. The exposition of EWALD and ELSTER, which allies נהג with the Aramaic נהג, "to sigh," and the corresponding Arabic verb, in the sense of "experiencing disgust with something" ("whilst my heart was weary with wisdom"), is too far-fetched, and contradicts what is said in ix. 13; ff., which confirms our conception of the passage.* For

---

*[There is no contradiction, real or apparent, to be reconciled, if ver. 24 is only rightly rendered as it simply stands in the Hebrew, without any addition. See Note on that passage.—T. L.]

†[תַּרְתִּי—תּוּר, is very emphatic here. It denotes a deep and earnest search. The primary sense *to go about*, hence, *investigate*, appears very strong, Eccles. vii 25: I went round about (סַבּוֹתִי), "I and my heart, to know and to explore (לָתוּר), and to seek out wisdom, *etc.*" It is the word used of the *spies* sent out to search the land, Numb. xiii. 2, 16, 17, 21, 25, 32; xiv. 6, 7, *etc.*, also of travelling merchants, *peregrinators* (2 Chron. ix. 14; 1 Kings x. 15) seeking for precious merchandise. בְּלִבִּי not, *with my heart* as an instrument, but *in my heart* as the dark place to be explored. He resolves to act as a *spy upon himself*, or, to use the quaint language of Halliburton in detailing his religious experience, "to see what his heart was doing in the dark"—like those whom Ezekiel saw in "the chambers of imagery"—or to find out how it might be possible in this interior chamber of the soul, to reconcile a devoted pursuit of pleasure, and, at the same time, a true pursuit of wisdom. The language implies a most intense study, as well as effort, to solve a difficult problem.—T. L.]

*[Chap. ii. 3, לִמְשׁוֹךְ. This passage and word have given much trouble. ZÖCKLER's view, though substantially that of GESENIUS and HENGSTENBERG, is unsatisfactory. It is very remotely derived, if it can be derived at all, from the ordinary sense of מָשַׁךְ, *to draw, draw out*, and is supported by little or no analogy in language. The Latin *tracto*, from *traho*, never has the sense *curare*, which would come the nearest to it. The Syriac מְשַׁךְ with which GESENIUS compares it, is a very rare and doubtful word, given by CASTELL without any examples, and nowhere found, either in the Syriac Scriptures, or in any well known Syriac writings. KNOBEL gives מָשַׁךְ the sense of *holding fast*, which would have done very well had he attached to it the idea of *restraining. holding* back, and made flesh the object, instead of the contrary, of *retaining*, not remitting (the use of wine). HEILIGSTEDT's *trahere, attrahere, attract*, is inconsistent with the preposition ב in בַּיַּיִן. MICHAELIS, sense of *protracting* is wholly unsuited to בְּשָׂרִי, flesh, as its object. EWALD's *an den Wein zu heften meine Sinne, to fasten on the wine*, *etc.*, gives hardly any sense at all, and what little there is, is opposed to the evident context. The same may be said of HERZFELD: *anzulocken meinen Leib;* the flesh needs no alluring. or drawing *to* the wine; besides the preposition בְּ is here also inconsistent with such a meaning. The lxx. *ἡ καρδία μου ἑλκύσει τὴν σάρκα μου ὡς οἶνον*, wholly inverts the idea. The Syriac לְכַבְּסמוּ *delight* my flesh, is a mere accommodating guess. The Vulgate *abstrahere, a vino carnem meam*, suits very well with לִמְשׁוֹךְ, but would require the preposition מִ (מִיַּיִן instead of בַּיַּיִן). Our

Digitized by Google

נהג in the sense of guiding, leading, comp. Isa. xi. 6; 1 Chron. xiii. 7; 2 Sam. vi. 3, *etc.*—**And to lay hold on folly, or also to seize folly.** —With "*folly*" (סִכְלוּת) cannot here naturally be meant as an exclusive contrast with wisdom; therefore not folly in the absolute sense, but mainly that foolish, sensual pleasure, which is referred to in ver. 2, or even that mentioned in ver. 3, "comforting the flesh with wine;" therefore a disposition which gives the reins to pleasure, and lives thoughtlessly in accordance with the assertion of HORACE: *Dulce est desipere in loco.* KOHELETH, from the beginning, recognizes this sentiment as folly, and thus designates it in contempt. But nevertheless he will prove it, and try whether it may not be relatively best for man, better than cold, fruitless, and wearisome wisdom, which when gained produces sorrow, and with which he was disgusted according to chapter first." (ELSTER).—**Till I might see what was that good for the sons of men,** *etc.* Comp. vii. 19.—**Which they should do under the heaven all the days of their life.** There is in these words a kind of mournful resignation. Short as is the period of human life on earth, even for this little span of time it is not always clear to man what is really good and beneficial for him; and many, and mostly bitter and painful experiences, are needed to bring him to this knowledge.—Ver. 4. **I made me great works; I builded me houses.** We are here certainly to understand the structures of Solomon in a general sense (1 Kings vii. 1, ff.; ix. 19; x. 18, ff., but hardly a special allusion to the temple, which Solomon could not have counted among his houses.—**I planted me vineyards** The Song of Solomon, chap. viii. 11, mentions one of these; and that Solomon had more of them, and had not overrated his wealth arbitrarily, and in violation of historic truth, (as KNOBEL supposes), is satisfactorily proved by the several vineyards of David enumerated in 1 Chron. xxvii. 27.—Ver. 5. **I made me gardens and orchards,**—in the environs of these houses or palaces, (comp. 1 Kings xxi. 2; Jer. lii. 7; also the Song of Solomon i. 16, f.). For the etymology of פַּרְדֵּס. See *Int.* to the *Song*, § 3, obs. 2.—**And I planted trees in them of all kind of fruits;** therefore not merely one of one kind, but many of many kinds of fruit trees. The emphasis does not rest on פְּרִי as if it would declare the King's object to be to raise trees affording delightful and delicate enjoyment (KNOBEL), but on כָּל־ whereby the rich variety of fruit trees is pointed out.—Ver. 6.—**I made me pools of water;** perhaps those mentioned in the Song (vii. 4), as at Heshbon; perhaps also the king's pool at Jerusalem, mentioned in Neh. ii. 14, which a later tradition, at least, marked as a work of Solomon. (Josephus, *B.*,

English version, "to give *myself* to wine," is as safe a guess as any, but it leaves out the important word בְּשָׂרִי "my flesh," unless it is intended to have its meaning conveyed in the word *myself*, as though it were equivalent to נַפְשִׁי. This, however, is without warrant in the Scriptures. Besides, it destroys the contrast evidently intended between בשר and לב, the *body* and the *mind*, which לב more generally means (comp. Prov. vii. 7; xvii. 7, with most of the places where it occurs in that book and this), or the *soul* generally, as in Ps. lxxiii. 25, where it is in contrast with שאר—"my flesh and heart"—body and soul.

The ordinary Hebrew meaning of משך is to *draw out*. Closely allied to it is the sense of the Arabic مسك *to hold*, lay hold of, which runs through all the Arabic conjugations. This is the primary, and the sense most likely intended here: *to lay hold of*, *hold back* my flesh, that is, to govern, check, restrain it. The unusual style of the language shows that there is a figure here, and what that figure is is suggested by the word נֹהֵג in the following clause. The ordinary, and, we think, the primary sense of this word is *egit agitavit*. Hence it is applied to the driving of flocks, Gen. xxxi. 18; Exod. iii. 1: Ps lxxx. 2, but more especially and significantly, to the *driving* or *guiding* of horses and chariots, as 2 Sam. vi. 3; 2 Kings ix. 20, where the noun מִנְהָג is most graphically used to describe the *mad* driving of Jehu. From this use in the Scriptures, the Rabbins have, very naturally, and according to the analogy of secondary senses as they spring up in other languages, employed it, with an ethical and philosophical meaning, to denote a *course* of thinking, conduct (*ductus*) or as a rule for the *guidance* of life. Thus viewed it strikingly suggests some such figure as seems hinted in מָשַׁךְ, though there the metaphor may be said to lie concealed; all the more impressive, however, when seen, on account of its inobtrusiveness. It is noticed by HITZIG, who sees the figure, yet misapplies it, or falls back, after all, to the other idea of supporting, sustaining generally: "to draw with wine my flesh, that is, *die Maschine damit im Gange zu erhalten*, to keep the machine going, parallel with the expression to support the life with bread." Here he seems to drop the metaphor, yet takes it up again when he says, "the wine here is compared to a draught horse, or as we say of one who drinks on the way, he hath taken a relay." This is a vulgar view of the comparison, resembling some common Americanisms beneath the dignity of the real figure. And then he interprets what follows, of "wisdom guiding," by comparing it to the coachman sitting on the box. STUART follows him in this, but both may be said to err in making wine the unruly horse that needs guidance, instead of the *flesh* (בְּשָׂרִי). "On the whole," says STUART, "there can be no doubt that the sense thus given by HITZIG is significant; the main difficulty is the seeming strangeness of the figurative representation." With a little change, however, it is the same with Plato's more full and ornate comparison in the Phædrus 54 F, or as it may be called, the myth of the charioteer and his two horses. The body (the flesh with its lusts, its appetites) is the wild horse so graphically described as *κρατεραύχην μελάγχρως ὕφαιμος κ. τ. λ.*, "strong necked, black, with bloodshot furious eyes, full of violence, coarse, shaggy-eared, deaf, hard-yielding, either to the whip or the spur." The gentle horse is the pure feeling, the "Platonic love," or celestial Eros, and the charioteer is the Νοῦς, or Reason, the Hebrew לב *guiding* or driving with חכמה. If it seems strange to interpret KOHELETH by PLATO, it may be said that the figure is, in itself, very easy and natural, coming directly from primary analogies, and in accordance with the whole train of the preacher's thought: I sought diligently, when my flesh was furiously driving on *in wine*, or pleasure (ביין here not denoting the instrument, or figurative chariot, but the state or condition) to draw it, to restrain it, to bridle it, to keep it, in the path of temperance. On this account we have rendered it in the Metrical Version, "to rein my flesh in wine," and this is in harmony with the figure, as we find it so deeply grounded in language generally—a fact which makes its use by KOHELETH so little strange when properly considered. It is frequent in the Latin, both in prose and poetry. Comp. *Hor. Carmina* iv. 15, 16, *evaganti frena licentiæ injecit*, *Sat.* II. 7, 74. *Jam vaga prosiliet frenis natura remotis*; Ep. I. 263, *hunc (animum) frenis hunc tu compesce catena*, Liv. xxxiv. 2, *date frenos impotenti naturæ*; Juv. viii. 88. *pone iræ frena modumque*, *Seneca*, Ep. xxiii. *voluptates tenere sub freno; etc., etc.* So the phrases *dare frena* and *dare habenas—laxis habenis, etc.* In the same way the Greek χαλινὸς and χαλινόω. Its use is common in English, whether derived from classical examples or, as is more likely, having a spontaneous origin: "To give the reins to appetite" (the very expression that ZÖCKLER unconsciously uses, *der Lust die Zügel schiessen lassen*) or the contrary—to "lay the reins upon the neck of pleasure,"—with the idea of the unruly horse. If, after all, it should be said that this is not in the ordinary Hebrew style, it may be replied that neither is KOHELETH in the style of other Hebrew books, and, therefore, that kind of criticism, so assuming, but, ofttimes, so superficial, cannot, with certainty, be applied to it.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

Jud. v., 4, 2); and certainly those situated in Wadi Urtâs, near Bethlehem and Erham, "*Pools of Solomon*," mentioned in the exposition of the Song of Solomon, and which are doubtless here principally meant.—**To water therewith the wood that bringeth forth trees,** צוֹמֵחַ intransitive * as in Prov. xxiv. 31; Isa. v. 6; xxxiv. 15. The object of these pools as artificial basins for irrigating the extensive orchards of the king, testify to the magnificence and expense of these grounds. Ver. 7. **I got me servants and maidens, and had servants born in my house.** (*Lit., were to me*, as in ver. 10), namely, from the marriages of the men and maid servants in my house. בְּנֵי בַיִת Gen. xv. 2, or יְלִידֵי בַיִת Gen. xii. 27; Jer. ii. 14, are slaves born in the house (*vernæ, οἰκογενεῖς*), and on account of their natural fidelity and affection a very valuable possession; here, however, named mainly because their presence was the sign and necessary result of numerous servants, and, consequently, of a large and flourishing household — **Also I had great possessions, of great and small cattle.** After the wealth in men and maid servants, as in Gen. xii. 16; xxx. 43, directly follow the great possessions of cattle, and then comes his wealth in unproductive treasures, silver and gold, as Gen. xiii. 2. The historical books of the Old Testament mention not only David (1 Chron. xxvii. 29, f.), but also his son and heir Solomon (1 Kings v. 3; viii. 63), as wealthy possessors of herds. For the concluding words of this verse: **above all that were in Jerusalem before me,** see remarks on chap. i. 16—Ver. 8. **I gathered me also silver and gold.** כָּנַסְתִּי, lit., "I heaped up," that is in treasuries, as in the gorgeous apartments of my palace. The result of this unceasing activity of Solomon in collecting treasures, is depicted in 2 Chron. i. 15, ix. 27; 1 Kings x. 27: "Silver and gold at Jerusalem were as plenteous as stones."—**And the peculiar treasure of kings, and of the provinces.** For מְדִינָה province, district, comp. Int. § 4, obs. 2. סְגֻלָּה, lit. property, is here and in 1 Chron. xxix. 8, equivalent to wealth, treasures. By "kings" are naturally first meant those tributary rulers of the neighboring lands treated of in 1 Kings v. 1; x. 15; but farther on those friendly rulers, who, as the Queen of Sheba, 1 Kings x. 2 ff., brought voluntary gifts, or even sent them, (as through the ships of Ophir, 1 Kings, ix. 28; x. 11, 14, 22; 2 Chron. viii. 28). The provinces are those twelve districts into which Solomon divided the land for the purpose of taxation, 1 Kings iv. 7 ff.—**I gat me men-singers and women-singers;**—the latter doubtless belonging to the women used for courtly display, mentioned in the Song of Solomon under the name of "Daughters of Jerusalem," or "Virgins without number," (chap. vi. 8); the former were of course not singers of the temple (as in 1 Kings x. 12; 1 Chron. xxv. 1 ff.; 2 Chron. v. 12), but singers of lively, worldly songs, as kept by David according to 2 Sam. xix. 36, and afterwards certainly by Solomon for enhancing the pleasures of the table, (comp. Isa. v. 12; Amos vi. 5).—For עָשָׂה to get, to keep, comp. 2 Sam. xv. 1; 1 Kings i. 5.—**And the delights of the sons of men, as musical instruments, and that of all sorts** (Zöckler has rendered שִׁדָּה וְשִׁדּוֹת *die Hülle und Fülle, in great abundance.*—T. L.

The words שִׁדָּה וְשִׁדּוֹת are most probably to be translated according to the Arabic by "multitude and multitudes," or also by "heap and heaps" (Ewald, Elster, *etc.*), whereby a very great abundance is meant, and indeed of הַתַּעֲנֻגוֹת *i. e.*, of caresses, of enjoyments and pleasures of sexual love, to which Solomon was too much given according to 1 Kings xi. 3; Song of Solomon, vi. 8. J. D. Michaelis, Rosenmueller, Herzfeld, Knobel, Hitzig, *etc.*, translate "mistress and mistresses," or "woman and women." a signification which they seek to justify etymologically in various ways from the Arabic, but which can no more be considered certain than the explanation resting on the Chaldaic שְׁדָא "to pour," which ancient translators turn into cupbearers, male and female * (*Sept. οἰνοχόους καὶ οἰνοχόας, Hieronymus, ministros vini et ministras*). Ver. 9. **So I was great and increased.** (Lit. I became great and added thereto (הוֹסַפְתִּי as i. 16). This is meant, of course, in the sense of possessions and riches, consequently in the sense of Gen. xxvi. 13; Job i. 3.—**Also my wisdom remained with me:** עָמְדָה־לִּי Lit. (*It stood by me*), it remained at my side, left me not, notwithstanding the fact that my outward man yielded to these follies and vanities. Thus must it be rendered according to ver. 3, and not "*my wisdom served me,*" (Ewald), or "*sustained me,*" Elster. (Comp. the *Vulg. perseveravit mecum*).—Ver. 10. **And whatsoever mine eyes desired I kept not from them.** That is, I possessed not only an abundance of all earthly goods, but I sought also to enjoy them; I withheld from me no object of my pleasure. Concerning the eyes as seat and organ of sensual desire, consult Ps. cxlv. 15; 1 Kings xx. 6; 1 John

*[Although a participle in form, צוֹמֵחַ, has rather the force of an adjective denoting fulness, luxuriance, (see Metrical version); not bringing forth trees, as our English version has it, but *blooming*, luxuriant with, or in *trees*.—T. L.]

*[שִׁדָּה וְשִׁדּוֹת. There is no need of going to the Arabic for this word. A great many different views have been taken of it, but the best commentators seem agreed that it refers to Solomon's many wives and concubines. This is the opinion of Aben Ezra, who thinks that it would have been very strange if such luxuries had been omitted from this list. He, however, would make it from שָׁדַד, with the sense of female *captives*, taken as the spoil in war. Others who render it wives, like Hitzig, Stuart, *etc.*, make it from the Arabic سند *to lean upon*, Infin. iii. conj. سناد to embrace. But there is a nearer Hebrew derivation from שַׁד *mamma*, the breast. The feminine form is used as more voluptuous.—שִׁדָּה the swelling breast, *mammæ sororiantes*. The plural after the singular is intensive to denote the vast number of these luxuries that Solomon possessed. The dagesh is easily accounted for without making it from שָׁדַד, or the Arabic سند. By the addition there is a sharp-

Digitized by Google

ii. 16.—* **I withheld not my heart from any joy.** KOHELETH does not mean thereby that he enjoyed every imaginable pleasure, but only that he kept his heart open for every pleasure that presented itself to him, and profited by every one; that he avoided no pleasure that presented itself to him, (comp. HITZIG). That this is the sense is proved by the following: **For my heart rejoiced in all my labour; and this was my portion of all my labours.** KOHELETH allowed himself, therefore, those pleasures and enjoyments which resulted from his continued exertion and labor, which formed agreeable resting places in the midst of his painful and fatiguing life; he sought and found in the hours of cheerful enjoyment, that interrupted his mainly painful existence, a recompense for his troubles and sorrows,—a recompense, it is true, that was only of a transitory nature (consequently no lasting, but simply an apparent חֵלֶק), and which thus, just as the toil and labor, belonged to that vexation of spirit that formed mainly the sum and substance of his experience. For שָׂמֵחַ מִן lit.: "to extract joy from anything," comp. Prov. v. 18; 2 Chron. xx. 27. In opposition to the explanation of HAHN *et al.*—my heart rejoiced *after* all my labor, stands the following expression: This was my portion (*i. e.*, my profit, my advantage), of all my labor.—Ver. 11. **Then I looked on all the works,** *etc.*, lit.: I turned to all my works (פָּנָה בְּ as Job vi. 28); comp. ver. 12. **And on the labour that I had laboured to do,** *i. e.*, to produce these, my toilsome works. **And, behold, all was vanity and vexation of spirit.** "All," that is, the substance of all my efforts, those referring to the collecting of great riches, and the founding of a great dominion, as well as those aiming after cheerful enjoyment; "in nothing of all this did I recognise a lasting חֵלֶק, a real יִתְרוֹן (comp. chap. i. 3); everything seemed to me rather as רְעוּת רוּחַ (see i. 14)." *In how far and why* this formed the result of his experience, is shown in the sequel (ver. 12–19); there only does this general conclusion: there is no profit under the sun, as here expressed in anticipation, find its full justification.

4. *First Division, second strophe:* Vers. 12–19. That there is no profit under the sun, appears above all clearly from the fact that the wise man, with reference to his final destiny, and the end of his life, has no advantage over the fool, in so far as he meets the same death as the latter through a necessity of nature, and is obliged to leave the fruits of his labor often enough to foolish heirs and successors.—Ver. 12. **And I turned myself to behold wisdom, and madness, and folly;** *i. e.*, to observe them in their relation to each other, and consider their relative value; comp. i. 17. HITZIG's conception that "madness and folly" are correlatives is altogether too artificial; he holding that by these the result of the consideration of wisdom is expressed, and that a connective ("and, behold, it was)" has been omitted. **For what can the man do that cometh after the king? even that which hath been already done.** This, "that has already been done," consists naturally in a foolish and perverted beginning, even in the destruction of what has been done by a wise predecessor, and in the dispersion of the treasures and goods collected by him, (comp. for this negative, or rather catachrestic sense of the verb to do, Matt. xvii. 12). J. D. MICHAELIS, KNOBEL, and HENGSTENBERG, substantially coincide with this explanation of the somewhat obscure and difficult words; it is confirmed as well by the context as by the masoretic punctuation. Nearest allied to this is the conception of ROSENMUELLER: "For who is the man who can come after the king? Answer: For what has been he will do." Thus also DE ROUGEMENT: "Who is the man who could hope to be more fortunate in following after him (King Solomon) on this false path? We can try it, but it will be with us as it has been with all before us." HITZIG reads in the concluding line עֲשׂוּהוּ instead of עָשׂוּהוּ, and therefore translates: What will the successor of the king do? "That which he hath already done." LUTHER, VAIHINGER, as also the *Septuagint* and the *Vulgate*, only translating more concretely, do not take אֵת אֲשֶׁר כְּבָר עָשׂוּהוּ, as an independent, responsive clause, but as a relative clause: "What will the man be who will come after the king, who has already been chosen?" (LUTHER, "whom they have already made"). HAHN also says: "What is the man who will come after the king, in respect to that which has already been done;" and EWALD and ELSTER: "How will the man be who follows the king, compared with him whom they chose long ago," *i. e.*, with his predecessor? Some Rabbinic exegetists, whom even DRUSIUS is inclined to follow, have referred עָשׂוּהוּ to God as active subject, which is here expressed as a plurality (trinity): "with the One (or beside the One) who has made him;" for which sense they refer to Ps. cxlix. 2: Job xxxv. 10; Isa. liv. 1, *etc.*—Ver. 13. **Then I saw that wisdom excelleth folly, as far as light excelleth darkness.**—The poet recognizes the absolute worth of wisdom, just as in the first clause of ver. 14 he more clearly describes its profit for the individual. For the comparison of wisdom and folly with light and darkness, comp. Prov. vi. 23; Matth. vi. 33 f.; John viii. 12, *etc.* "As light is a creative power that bears within itself an independent life, and produces life wherever it penetrates, and darkness, on the contrary, is a negation of light, a numb and dead

---

ecing of the first syllable, which requires dagesh and the shortening of the vowel from pitach to chirek. See Introduction to Metrical Version, p. 180. The Syriac has שקותא ושקיתא corresponding nearly to the lxx. οἰνοχόους καὶ οἰνοχόας, *cup-bearers, or wine-pourers.* ZÖCKLER's rendering has but little or no support. The late Arabic translation of Dr. Vandyke well renders it سيدة وسيدات ladies, mistresses; though from a different root, it comes to the same thing with the Hebrew.—T. L.

* For a most impressive statement of this, revealing the whole philosophy of *will* and *choice* (the *will* following the *sense*, or the sense in subjection to the will) see Job's declaration, Job xxxi. 27, אִם אַחַר עֵינַי הָלַךְ לִבִּי: If my *heart*, (the seat of moral power) hath gone after mine eyes (the sense generally), then, *etc.* It is an emphatic denial that he had permitted sense to govern him.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

element,—so is the real strength of life in wisdom alone, whilst folly is vain, empty, and unsubstantial" (ELSTER).—Ver. 14. **The wise man's eyes are in his head; but the fool walketh in darkness.**—An assumed syllogism, in which the conclusion is wanting: "therefore, it stumbles and falls;" comp. John xi. 10. By the eyes which the wise man carries in his head, *i. e.*, in the right place, are meant, of course, the eyes of the understanding (Eph. i. 18), the inward organ of spiritual knowledge, the eye of the spirit (Prov. xx. 27; Matth. vi. 23, *etc.*). Comp. CICERO, *de Natura Deorum*, 2, 64. *Totam licet animis tamquam oculis lustrare terram.*—**And I myself perceived also that one event happeneth to them all.**—גַּם adversative, as iii. 13; iv. 8, 16. מִקְרֶה literal: occurrence, accident or chance; comp. ver. 15; iii. 19, *etc.*, which here clearly designate death, the physical end of man, the return to dust of one born of dust, as a destiny resting on the Divine curse (Gen. iii. 19).*—Ver. 15. **As it happeneth to the fool, so it happeneth even to me.**—The general assertion of the latter clause of ver. 14 is now specially applied to the person of Koheleth, as belonging to the class of wise men.—גַּם־אֲנִי יִקְרֵנִי literally: "I also, it will happen to me." The person being made prominent by the isolated pronoun in the nominative, placed at the beginning, as in Gen. xxiv. 27; Ezek. xxxiii. 17; 2 Chron. xxviii. 10.—**And why was I then more wise?**—That is, "what profits me now my great wisdom? what advantage does it afford me compared with the fool?" For this expression comp. 1 Cor. xv. 30; Gal. v. 11.—אָז now, therefore, if such is the case, is said in view of the dying hour, from which the author looks back on the whole of his past life.—יֹתֵר a participle used substantively, synonymous with יִתְרוֹן, advantage, profit, here an adverb, excessively, too much, comp. vii. 16.—**That this also is vanity.**—"*This*," namely, the arrangement that the wise man dies as the fool, that the same night of death awaits them both. Observe that Koheleth does not declare this disposition an injustice, but only as vanity, for a new phase of that fullness of vain, empty appearances which his experience in life has made him acquainted with. הֶבֶל here signifies, as at the end of ver. 19 (also chap. viii. 10, 14), something objectively vain, in contrast to the vanity of subjective human thoughts, knowledge and efforts hitherto indicated by it. It means the same objective ματαιότης of this lower world, derived from the fall, of which Paul, Rom. viii. 20, says, that the entire earthly creature, like man himself, is subjected to it.—Ver. 16. **For there is no remembrance of the wise more than of the fool forever**—*i. e.*, as is the fool, so is the wise man forgotten after his death; posterity thinks of the one as little as of the other. This assertion is, of course, to be relatively understood, like the similar one in chap. i. 11; not all posthumous fame of men is denied; it is simply asserted to be ordinarily and most generally the case, that posterity retains no special remembrance of those who have previously lived, which, in reference to the great majority * of individuals is certainly wholly true.—עִם הַכְּסִיל lit., "with the fool," is equivalent to "as the fool;" comp. vii. 10; Job ix. 26; xxxvii. 18.—לְעוֹלָם belongs in conception with זִכְרוֹן, "no remembrance for eternity," the same as, no eternal remembrance, no lasting recollection.—**Seeing that which is now in the days to come shall all be forgotten.**—הַיָּמִים הַבָּאִים is the accusative of time, comp. Isa. xxvii. 6; Jer. xxviii. 16.—כְּבָר is to be connected with the verb, as also chap. ix. 6, and is therefore to be rendered: "because every thing will have long been forgotten" (נִשְׁכָּח the future past).—**And how dieth the wise man? as the fool!**—(A simple exclamation in the Ger.). A painful cry of lamentation,†

*[The word מִקְרֶה, though it may be rendered *chance*, does not denote that which happens without a cause, but simply that which *oc-curs*. The same may be said of the Greek τύχη. The Hebrew word, however, may be better compared with the Homeric κήρ, which it resembles in having the same radical consonants (κ ρ), though doubtless, etymologically, different [in this respect it agrees better with κύρω]. It carries rather the sense of the *inevitable*, or of *doom*, like the Greek αἶσα, μοῖρα, which, with κήρ, are used to denote death as the great *doom* of our race. So the Latin *fatum*, and so of all those old words. The earlier we go up in language, the less do we find in these or similar words any thought of chance or fate, in the atheistic sense, but rather the contrary—namely that of *decree* (fatum), destiny fixed by an intellectual power. So Koheleth seems to use מִקְרֶה here and the verb קָרָה. There is, in the whole context, a recognition of something more than a "*debt of nature*," an atheistical kind of language which our Christianity does not prevent us from using. The whole aspect of the passage favors the idea of an inevitable *doom* (decree, sentence) fixed upon the race, from which no wisdom, no virtue exempts. "Death hath passed upon all men for that all have sinned." To one who views them in their true and earliest character, these old Greek words above mentioned are the very echo of such a sentence. They are all used for death and often, in Homer and elsewhere, may be so rendered. The epithets joined with them show the same idea, as something inconsistent with the thought of chance, or blind physical law.—T. L.]

*[The emphasis here is on the word לְעוֹלָם, and it is asserted, whether hyperbolically or not, of all. No memory lasts forever, or for *the world*. The greatest fame, at last, goes out. In this respect, or in comparison with לְעוֹלָם, the differences of time, in human fame, are regarded by the philosophical Seer as of no moment. A remembrance ever lost is equal to oblivion.—T. L.

† ii. 16. וְאֵיךְ "And O, how is it?" It is an exclamatory burst of irrepressible feeling, laying open the very heart of the writer. It is the great mystery that so perplexes him, but for which he knows there is some cause consistent with the Divine wisdom and justice. Some great doom [מִקְרֶה like the Greek κήρ, αἶσα μοῖρα] has come upon all the race, the wise, the foolish, the just, the unjust, the unholy, the comparatively pure (see ix. 2), and for some fundamental moral reason applicable to them all alike,—as a race rather than as individuals. "*O, why is it?*" It is no scepticism in regard to God's righteous government, no denial of essential moral distinctions; it is not an assertion of Epicurean recklessness on the one hand, nor of a stoical fatality on the other, but a cry of anguish at a spectacle ever passing before his eyes, and which he fails clearly to comprehend. It is as though he were arguing with the Sovereign Omnipotence. Like the language of Job and Habakkuk, in similar seasons of despondency, it seems to manifest, almost, a querulous tone of interrogatory: Why is there no difference? "Why dost thou make men as the fishes of the sea?" [Hab. i. 14, and comp. Eccles. ix. 12]: why dealest thou thus with us? "What shall I do unto thee, O thou Watcher of men?" [Job vii. 20]. It seems almost irreverent, and yet there is no cant about it, no suppression of the honest feeling of surprise, no artificial humility imposing on itself in the use of any formal language of resignation. Koheleth here appears

Digitized by Google

which, by an appeal to the experience of the reader, is to represent what is asserted as incontestable.—Ver. 17. **Therefore I hated life.** —שָׂנֵאתִי does not indicate the strong effect of actual hatred or hostile feeling, but the feeling of disgust, weariness, antipathy towards a thing. Comp. the Vulg.: *tæduit me vitæ meæ*, and also for this same milder sense of the verb, Isa. xiv. 1; Amos v. 13; Malachi i. 3.—**Because the work that is wrought under the sun is grievous unto me.**—That is, the view of every thing occurring under the sun bore painfully upon me, tortured me with an oppressive feeling; comp. EWALD, *Manual*, § 217, *i. y.*; comp. also chap. i. 14.—Ver. 18.—**Yea, I hated all my labor,** *etc.*—Not simply the doings of men in general, but also his own exertions, appeared hateful to the Preacher, because they were vain and fruitless.—**Because I should leave it to the man that shall be after me**—that is, to my successor, heir; comp. ver. 12. He must leave to his heirs not the labor itself, but what he had acquired thereby, its fruit, its result, and this grieves him—why, the following verse, tells.—For the form אַנִּיחֶנּוּ Imp. Hiph. from נוּחַ comp. EWALD, § 122, *e.*—Ver. 19 heightens the thought of ver. 18, and thereby leads back definitively to ver. 12, as the starting point of the present reflection on the uncertainty and transitory nature of all earthly possessions (for wise men as well as for fools).—**Wherein I have labored, and wherein I have showed myself wise under the sun.**—שֶׁעָמַלְתִּי וְשֶׁחָכַמְתִּי lit., "which I have obtained by trouble, and in which I have employed wisdom." A zeugma for: by whose wearisome acquirement I have showed myself wise.

5. *Second Division, first strophe.*—Ver. 20–23. On account of the painful truth of what has just been demonstrated, one must despair of all external earthly success of this earthly life, as does the Preacher at the evening of his life.—**Therefore I went about to cause my heart to despair.**—(Lit. Ger., "turned around"). וְסַבּוֹתִי different from וּפָנִיתִי ver. 12, does not mean to turn *in order to see any thing*, but a turning around in order to do something, comp. vii. 25; 1 Sam. xxii. 17, 18. The idea of turning from a former occupation is also included.*—The Piel יִאֵשׁ to permit to despair, to give up to despair, is only found here in the O. T.; the Niph. נוֹאַשׁ *desperavit* is more usual (or also the neuter participle: *desperatum est*), whilst the Kal does not occur.—Ver. 21. **For there is a man whose labor is in wisdom, and in knowledge, and in equity.**—Lit., whose labor is with wisdom, *etc.* (שֶׁעֲמָלוֹ בְּחָכְמָה), or also: whose labor has been, *etc.*; for הָיָה the verb supplemented to עֲמָלוֹ, can express both a present and a perfect sense. Wisdom is not here designated as the aim of labor, as EWALD supposes ("whose labor aims after wisdom"), but as the means whereby the aim of עָמָל, the fruit of human exertion shall be attained. Besides wisdom, knowledge and equity are also named as means to this end. (דַּעַת comp. i. 16, 18; ii. 26); for this is what כִּשְׁרוֹן here means, not success, favorable result, as chap. v. 9. The Sept. is also correct, ἀνδρεία, and substantially so also the Vulg. (*sollicitudo*), and LUTHER (ability, capability).—**Yet to a man who has not labored therein shall he leave it for his portion.**—שֶׁלֹּא עָמַל־בּוֹ; for בּוֹ refers to the principal thought of the preceding clause, and not to חָכְמָה. For עָמַל בְּ, to labor for a thing; comp. Jonah iv. 10. The suffix in יִתְּנֶנּוּ also refers to עָמָל, and חֶלְקוֹ is a second object: "he gives it to him as *his portion*, his share"—Ver. 22. **For what hath man of all his labor.** הֹוֶה lit.: falls to, falls suddenly down upon (Job xxxvii. 6); in the later Chaldaic style, to happen, to become, to be appointed to; comp. xi. 2; Neh. vi. 6.—**And of the vexation of his heart.**—Herewith are principally, if not exclusively, meant these three synonyms: Wisdom, knowledge and equity, ver. 21. The aspiration of the heart is the essence of the plans and designs which form the motive of the labor and exertion of man, and give to them their direction and definite aim.—Ver. 22. **Wherein he hath labored under the sun.** —The relative refers to כָּל עֲמָלוֹ as well as to רַעְיוֹן לִבּוֹ.—Ver. 23. **For all his days are sorrows and his travail grief.**—עִנְיָנוֹ (comp. i. 13) bears here again the meaning of daily labor (HITZIG, ELSTER, VAIHINGER, *etc.*), a stronger expression that would remind us of Ps. xlii. 8. Comp. also Ps. xc. 10.—**Yea, his heart taketh not rest in the night**—that is, it remaineth awake, troubled by anxious thoughts and plans, or tortured by unquiet dreams; comp. v. 12; Song of Solomon v. 2.

6. *Second Division, second strophe.*—Vers. 24–26. We are not always to remain in this aban-

---

like one complaining,—not in anger, but in grief. He seems to say, as Job said, "Suffer me to plead with thee." It is that sublime style of *expostulation* which so strikes us, and, sometimes, almost terrifies us, in the grand Old Testament men of God. Our English Version is very tame: "and how dieth," *etc.* The conjunction וְ has, in fact, an interjectional force, making more marked the exclamation אֵיךְ, by showing an emotional rather than a logical connection; as though it were something suddenly springing up, or irrepressibly prompted by the previous soliloquizing utterance [see remarks on Job xxviii., and on the particle כִּי, in the Introduction to Metrical Version, p. 177]: "Since the days come when all is forgotten; *but* O how is it" (as it should be rendered instead of *and*, since the conjunction is rather disjunctive than merely copulative, and, therefore, the more suggestive of emotion]: Alas, how is it, that the wise should die as dies the fool! See the Metrical Version. It does not mean that the wise man dieth *in the same manner* as the fool—that is, recklessly, stupidly, or despairingly, but rather that he dies as well as the fool; he, no more than the other, escapes the universal "sentence that hath passed upon all men" for the reasons given Gen. iii. 19; Rom. v. 12. In truth עִם הַכְּסִיל, [literally, with the fool) can hardly mean, *wie der Thor*, in like manner as the fool, as ZÖCKLER holds—but rather, *in company* with the fool. It is companionship, rather than other resemblance; and so, too, does the preposition keep its original sense in Eccles. vii. 11; Job ix. 26; xxxvii. 18, the places to which ZÖCKLER refers.—T. L.].

*[It may be rather said that סַבּוֹתִי, here, is simply intensive of פָּנִיתִי. It means *to turn round and round*—indicating perplexity, wanderings, or evolutions of mind—*I revolved.* See Metrical Version.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

donment of hope of external happiness, but to seek the necessary contentment of the heart in the cheerful and grateful enjoyment of the blessings of life, which God bestows on those of His children who find favor in His sight; and even this enjoyment is something vain and futile, so far as it does not stand in the power of man, but must be graciously conferred by God.—**There is nothing better for man than that he should eat and drink,** *etc.*—The words אֵין טוֹב בָּאָדָם שֶׁיֹּאכַל וְגוֹ permit a threefold conception: 1. Interrogative: "Is it not better for man to eat," *etc.* (thus LUTHER, OETINGER, HENGSTENBERG, and the Vulg.: "*Nonne melius est comedere et bibere," etc.*). 2. Purely negative: "There is no happiness for the man who eats," *etc.* (thus the Sept., M. GEIER, DATHE, KNOBEL, HAHN). 3. On the supposition of the omission of מִן or of כִּי אִם before שֶׁיֹּאכַל, "there is no happiness for man but in eating." This last translation has the most to recommend it,* because the interrogative and the unconditional negative conception do not so well comport with the context, and because this latter especially would be in contradiction with the passages of chap. iii. 12, 22; v. 18 ff.; vii. 14; viii. 15; ix. 7-9, which recommend serene enjoyment of life as a means of acquiring happiness and contentment. And because, further, the ancient Aramaic translations confirm the omission of מ (compare iii.

*[This supposition that would supply מִן or כִּי אִם before שיאכל, is a very old one, for it is referred to, although not fully endorsed, by RASHI and ABEN EZRA, and is also mentioned by the grammarian JONA BEN GANNACH (*Abul Walid*) in Sect. 28, on Ellipsis. It is admitted, however, that there is not a trace of it in any ancient manuscript, or in any various reading. It is maintained solely on the ground of a supposed *exigentia loci*. There is wanted, it is thought, the sense that such an insertion would give, to bring it in harmony with some other passages, as they are mentioned by ZÖCKLER, and especially ix. 7-9. Now in respect to these it may be said, that if there were a real or seeming variance, such a fact would present no exegetical difficulty to one who takes the right view of this book as a series of meditations in which the writer, or utterer, to use his own expression, "*revolves*" (סבותי ii. 20), *goes round and round*, trying and testing different views of human life, "talking to his heart" [אמרתי אל לבי], now taking up one supposition, then "turning again" to another, now desponding, then again so sure that he says ידעתי, "I know,"—at another time indulging what is evidently a sorrowing irony, such as especially characterizes ix. vii. 9, as compared with xi. 9 (see the Exeget. and notes on these, and especially the two latter, in their respective places). The mere variance, therefore, whether seeming or real, is not sufficient to warrant so bold an interpolation into the text, unless there is a failure in obtaining any good sense at all from the passage as it stands. But this surely cannot be pretended. What better thought, and, at the same time, more literal as a version, than that given by the LXX., οὐκ ἔστιν ἀγαθὸν ἀνθρώπῳ ὃ φάγεται, κ. τ. λ.: "it is not good for man," or "the good is not for man what he eats," or "that he eat," *etc.*, which is favored by DATHE, KNOBEL, and HAHN. Or perhaps, still better than this, if we regard the context, is the translation of MARTIN GEIER, which he gives from JUNIUS, *non est bonum penes hominem ut edat, bibat," etc*: "the good is not *in the power of man* that he should eat and drink, *etc.*, for this I saw is from the hand of God himself." Thus, says GEIER, all things remain in their native sense, and there is no need of any ellipsis. It might be rendered, perhaps, "it is not *the* good for man (his *summum bonum*) to eat and drink;" or if that is regarded as too philosophical for Koheleth, and also as demanding the article, it may be rendered simply, "it is not good," or, "there is no good in it" (of itself). TREMELLIUS translates in the same way, *non est bonum penes hominem, etc.* The general sense then would be this: whatever good there may be in eating and drinking, *etc.*, it is not in man's power to secure it, or to find enjoyment in it ("make his soul see good in it"); and this is in such admirable harmony with the context: "it is the gift of God." The preposition בְּ in באדם, has this sense, as may be shown in many passages, and it corresponds exactly to our own most natural mode of speech: *it is not in him*. Even the power to enjoy comes from God. It is not strange that Rationalist Commentators should seek to give an Epicurean aspect to the passage, but it is matter of surprise that others called Evangelical should go out of their way to follow them. The interpretation thus given, as the most literal one, is also in perfect harmony with other passages, or rather, we might say, that the positive unqualified commendation of the gross Epicurean sentiment which the interpretation would give is in direct contradiction to the many declarations of vanity and worthlessness in respect to all mere wealth and pleasure-seeking, which are elsewhere found. This might be set off against the other assertion of variance, if either can be regarded as a right mode of exegesis in this book.

At all events, the literal rendering is all sufficient here—whilst the fair interpretation of other seemingly Epicurean passages only shows, as we think, a difference of aspect under which the great question is considered, but no contradiction to that doctrine which the writer is throughout most earnest to put forth as one of the fundamental ideas of his book, namely, that *all good is from God*, and that nothing is good without Him. See the Metrical Version: The consciousness of this, not eating, *etc.*, is the highest good.

RASHI interprets the אין טוב as meaning that "the good is not *simply* that man should eat, *etc.*, or it is not in eating *alone*; as much as to say, he should give his heart to do judgment and righteousness, together with his eating and drinking;" and then he proceeds to give historical illustration.

ABEN EZRA suggests the supplying (in the mind) of some such particle as רַק, meaning, not the *only* good, or that it is not good, in man, or for man, that he should *only* eat and drink, *etc.* Again, he seems to lay emphasis on the word בַּעֲמָלוֹ (in his toil), giving it as the general sense of the text, as it stands, that "this toil, with its weariness finds no other good (no higher good) than to eat and drink,"—thus shutting out any Epicurean idea and making it a depreciation of human effort rather than a commendation of sensual pleasure, in itself, as the best thing in life.

The Syriac inserts אלא, *unless*, without any thing to correspond to it in the Hebrew, and having very much the appearance of an accommodation to some later view, since it will not answer as a rendering of מ comparative (משיאכל), or מִן or כִּי אִם, as proposed. Besides this, it would not give the bald Epicurean idea of our translation that "eating is the *best* thing for man," but only that there is no good in man's power (or as proposed in human toil), unless it be this,—a sense which would resemble that of ABEN EZRA.

So also the Targum has אֱלָהֵן דִּי יֵיכוּל, "*unless* that he eat," *etc.*, but this version is of little or no authority, on account of its later date, and the paraphrastic absurdity of its midrashim. The sense given by it, however, is quite different from that given in E. V., or by ZÖCKLER: "There is nothing *that is fair* among men, unless to eat," *etc.*; and then it goes on to say לְמֶעְבַּד יַת פִּקּוּדַיָּא דַיְיָ וְגוֹ "that they may do the commandments of the Lord, and walk in his ways." If it be said that there is nothing in the Hebrew text to warrant this, it may be replied that so, also, is there nothing to warrant the insertion of אֱלָהֵן (*unless*), by which he supports this paraphrastic sense. It all seems evidently done to get a middle way between two views deemed untenable or inconsistent,—one asserting, or seeming to assert, that there was no good at all in eating, *etc.*, and the other that it was the highest and only good.

A strong argument for the literal rendering is derived from the context. The particle גַּם has an adversative and accumulative force; it denotes a rising in the thought. It connects itself here especially with the last part of what precedes: "that he should make his soul see good" (or find enjoyment in it): "The good is not in the power of man that he should eat, *etc.*, and make his soul see good" (or "so that he may make his soul see good in it," taken as a collective object); "yea, what is more [גַּם], this

22) before שֶׁיֹּאכַל, an omission which, on account of the ב in בְּאָדָם, and the like ending, might so easily take place, and finally because the idea of ב in בְּאָדָם with the sense of לְ, consequently in a sense designating an object, is confirmed by chap. iii. 12; x. 17; and the instrumental conception of this attempted by GEIER and KNOBEL, is therefore unnecessary.* To eat and drink, and let one's soul be merry, is therefore the triad of sensual life, which is sometimes used in a bad sense, of vicious excess and indulgence, and again in a good or morally unprejudicial sense. The former is found in Exodus xxxii. 6; Prov. xxiii. 7, 8; Judith xii. 13; 1 Cor. x. 17, *etc.*, the latter in this passage, and in Eccles. iii. 13; v. 17; viii. 15; and also in 1 Sam. xxx. 16; Isa. lxv. 13; Song of Solomon v. 1, *etc.* Comp. ZÖCKLER, *Theologia Naturalis*, p. 651 f., where are also produced from the classics many parallels of this combination of ideas in eating, drinking, and being merry; (*e. g., Euripides, Alcest.*, 788; *Arrian, Anab.*, II. 5, 4; *Plautus, Mil. glor.*, III., 1, 83).—That these maxims, to eat, drink, and be merry, are not here meant in the Epicurean sense of 1 Cor. xv. 32, is proved by the important addition בַּעֲמָלוֹ in his labor, in his toil, on which a special emphasis rests, and which excludes every thought of idle debauchery and luxurious enjoyment. See *Int.* § 5, and especially p. 24.—**This also I saw, that it was from the hand of God.** That is, not: I observed that as all else, so also this comes from the hand of God, but, at the same time with that truth, that eating, drinking, *etc.*, is the best for man, I perceived also that only the hand of God can bestow such cheerfulness in toil, and such a joyous and contented feeling in the midst of the fatigues of worldly avocations.—Ver. 25. **For who can eat, or who else can hasten hereunto more than I?** Lit. Ger., and who enjoy, except from Him? חוּשׁ lit., to make merry, to pass a life in carousing, *deliciis affluere* (Vulg.) hence to enjoy, to delight, not drink, tipple (*Sept. Syr.*, EWALD).—Instead of חוּץ מִמֶּנִּי we must read with the *Sept.*, *Syr.*, HIERONYMUS and eight manuscripts חוּץ מִמֶּנּוּ *except from Him.* For חוּץ מִמֶּנִּי in the comparative sense, "except me," or just as I, does not afford a thought in accordance with the text, and would not harmonize with the יָחוּשׁ and יֹאכַל (see *Vulg.* LUTHER, *etc.*). But the translation of HAHN: "for who shall eat and who shall pine for food, is beyond me, is beyond my power," is insufferably harsh. On the contrary, מִמֶּנּוּ *from Him* (comp. the preposition מִן in 2 Sam. iii. 37; 1 Kings xx. 33), accords admirably with the connection, and furnishes that thought reminding us of James i. 17, which we here above all things need. And, moreover, the reading מִמֶּנִּי appears to coincide with the equally faulty שֶׁיֹּאכַל for מִשֶּׁיֹּאכַל of the preceding verse. See HITZIG on this passage.*—Ver. 26. **For to the man that is good in his sight**, that is, to the just and God-fearing (comp. Neh. ii. 5; 1 Sam. xxix. 6), the opposite of חוֹטֶא. The idea of the retributive justice of God, meets us here for the first time in this book, but not yet so thoroughly developed as subsequently, *e. g.*, iii. 17; xi. 8; xii. 14.—**But to the sinner he giveth travail, to gather and to heap up.** לְחוֹטֶא stands absolute and is not to be supplemented by a new לְפָנָיו (like the טוֹב of the first clause of the verse), as if the sense were, to the one who is offensive to Him, who is a sinner in His sight. **That he may give to him that is good before God.** The object of לָתֵת is not the travail of the sinner, but the goods gathered by him through toil and travail, the treasures heaped up by him, but finally falling to the just. The same thought occurs in Prov. xiii. 22; xxviii. 8; Job xxvii. 17.—**This also is vanity and vexation of spirit**, namely, that one seeks his happiness in the cheerful enjoyment of sensual blessings, (according to the maxim in verse 24). This is also vanity, because the acquisition of goods and pleasures in this life, is by no means in the power of man, but depends solely on the free grace of God, which gives to its beloved while sleeping, (Ps. cxxvii. 2); but permits the wicked, instead of pleasures, to heap up vain wrath against the day of judgment, (Rom. ii. 5; James v. 3). Others consider the heaping up of travail on the part of the wicked, as the subject of the phrase (ELSTER and HENGSTENBERG), or that it designates the arbitrary distribution of the blessings of life on the part of God as vanity and vexation (KNOBEL), but thereby they depart equally far from the true train of thought which the author maintains since verse 24.

---

too [זֶה emphatic] I saw was the gift of God," the power of enjoyment as well as the means. If there is any good in them (such is the implication), it comes from above. This clearly denotes that there *is* a higher good, even the consciousness and recognition of the truth thus stated. It is therefore in logical opposition to the idea that there is nothing better for man than eating and drinking thus unqualifiedly asserted. Every reader must feel that there is something disjointed in our common English Version. It does not bring out the contrast, nor the climax. The other is not only the plainer and more literal translation of the Hebrew, as it stands, but the assertion may be ventured that there is no obtaining any other sense out of it. —T. L.]

*[The sense given to בְּ by GEIER, JUNIUS, and TREMELLIUS, is not only more common, but far more easy and natural. The references to iii. 12: x. 17, do not confirm the rendering given by ZÖCKLER. בָּם in iii. 12, more properly refers to the works of men taken collectively, above; or if it refers to men, it means there, as here, *in them,—in their power.*—T. L.]

*[We cannot agree with ZÖCKLER and HITZIG here. The sense they would give to חוּשׁ is found nowhere else in the Hebrew, unless it is thrust into this place. Everywhere else, 1 Sam xx. 38; Deut. xxxii. 35; Ps. cxix. 60; Hab. i. 18; Ps xx. 20; xxxviii. 23; xl. 14; lxx. 26; lxxi. 12; Job xx 2; Isa. v. 19; lx. 22, *etc.*, *etc.*; it means simply to *hasten*, and there is no need of going to the Arabic حَسّ or Syriac חַשׁ, which in form would correspond rather to חָשַׁשׁ. Besides, it requires a change in the text from מִמֶּנִּי to מִמֶּנּוּ which has no marginal keri to support it, and gives, moreover, a very far-fetched sense. See TEXT NOTE and *Metrical Version* Nothing could be more fitting than the sense which corresponds to the Hebrew as it stands.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

(*With Homiletical Hints.*)

The transition of KOHELETH in the beginning of the chapter, especially in vers. 1–8, from the striving after wisdom and knowledge to enjoyment, and from that to action, to the organizing and artificially producing deed (vers. 4–8) presents a certain similarity with the progress of GOETHE'S *Faust* from knowledge to enjoyment, and from that (in the sec. act) to the more serious duty of laboring and producing. For the magnificent undertakings, structures, and extension of possessions and acquirements described in vers. 4–8, can scarcely be considered as *mere* means of sensual enjoyment in the sense of KOHELETH (as in ELSTER, p. 55). He expressly confesses to have connected therewith a certain ideal object, if not of a religious, at least of an ethical and human character; this lies in the repeated assertion (ver. 8 and 9), that in the midst of these eudemonistic and practical efforts, wisdom remained the ruler of his heart. But the great difference between Faust and the Preacher, consists in the final solution of the grand enigma of earthly life, which in the former ends in an obscure, sentimental, and philosophical mysticism, whilst the latter returns from his wanderings in the sphere of effort after earthly wisdom, enjoyment and acquisition, into the safe haven of a clearly conscious, modestly practical, and filially pious faith in God's gracious and just government of the world. It is the humble, confidently trusting, and gratefully contented reliance on God's gracious hand, which, at the close of his vivid and almost startling description of the vanity of all earthly things, he recommends as the only true aim for the life and labors of man, (vers. 24–26). That all human exertions are vanity, even that modest striving after cheerful enjoyment and serene employment described in ver. 24, is firmly fixed in his mind, (according to ver. 26). But the acknowledgment of this fact does not impel him to a sullen despair of all happiness and peace, but rather leads from such a feeling of discontent and discouragement into the blissful repose of a heart wholly given to God, and thankfully enjoying the good and perfect gifts dispensed by Him. Not the indolent man of enjoyment, but the industrious, cheerful laborer; not the greedily grasping misanthropic miser, but the friend of humanity delighting in God, and well-pleasing to Him; not the sinner, but the pious child of God, strong in the faith, forms the ideal that he presents at the close of his observations on the vanity of human life, which, though agitated and complaining indeed, nowhere extend to despairing grief or frivolous scepticism.

A comprehensive homiletical consideration of *the whole chapter*, would, therefore, be able to present as its theme: "*The vanity of all earthly things, and the consoling power of a faithful reliance on God;*" or, in order to show more clearly the feature distinguishing this chapter from the preceding: "*The wrong and the right way to seek one's happiness on earth;*" or: "*Divine grace as the bestower of that happiness of men, vainly sought after by their own power and with earthly means,*" (comp. the following passages in the N. T.: John vi. 65; xv. 5; Eph. ii. 8; James i. 17, *etc.*). The principal divisions for a discourse on these contents would be: 1. No earthly enjoyment or possession leads to genuine happiness, (1–11); 2. Even the happiest and wisest man remains subject to the curse of death, common to all the sons of men, (12–19); 3. Genuine and lasting happiness (surviving this life) can only be obtained for man by a childlike, contented, and grateful reliance on God's gracious and paternal hand, (20–26).

HOMILETICAL HINTS TO SEPARATE PASSAGES.

Vers. 1 and 2. LUTHER: Many a one arranges all his matters with much toil and trouble, that he may have repose and peace in his old age, but God disposes otherwise, so that he comes into affairs that cause his unrest then to commence. Many a one seeks his joy in lust and licentiousness, and his life is embittered ever after. Therefore, if God does not give joy and pleasure, but we strive after it, and endeavor to create it of ourselves, no good will come of it, but it is, as Solomon says, all vanity. The best gladness and delight are those which one does not seek (for a fly may easily fall into our broth), but that which God gives to our hand.

STARKE: The joy of the world is so constituted that it entails repentance, mortification, and grief (1 John ii. 17; Luke xvi. 19, 28); but the pleasure that the faithful find in God, is spiritual, constant, satisfying, and inexpressible, (Isa. xxxv. 10; John xvi. 22).

STARKE: Vers. 8 ff.: Every natural man seeks, in his way, his heaven in sensual delights. But he too often sins thereby, and misuses the gifts of God (Wisdom 2, 6 ff.). God grants to man what is necessary to his body, as well as that which tends to his comfort. But how many forget God thereby!

GEIER: It is allowable to possess riches if they have been righteously acquired. But beware of avarice as well as extravagance.

WOHLFARTH: He who thinks to find the aim of his life in the highest measure of sensual enjoyment, is the victim of an error which will demand of him a fearful revenge in proportion as he tears himself from God, strives simply after false treasures, and neglects and despises the treasures of a higher world; he heaps upon himself a weighty responsibility on account of the misuse of his time, the wasting of his powers, and the evil administration of the goods confided to him by God, and by all this excludes himself, unconditionally, from the kingdom of God.

HANSEN:—9–11. The things of this world belong to the preservation, delight and convenience of external, sensual life. One may arrange them, therefore, with as much pomp, majesty and beauty as is possible; they can never, according to their nature, do more than delight our senses.—If we estimate their worth too high, they can take from us in inward ease of mind much more than they grant us in sensual delights and convenience, and become to us then a genuine scourge of the spirit.

STARKE:—If the children of the world are not without vexation and trouble in the accomplish-

Digitized by Google

ment of their sinful lusts, the children of God should be less surprised, if they in their work in the Lord must experience various disappointments and vexations.

HAMANN (Ver. 10):—We here find a trace of Divine goodness, which, notwithstanding the vanity of all our works, has placed in labor, and especially in useful occupations, which strike the eye and gain our approbation as well as that of others, a species of joy, a spice of pleasure which delights us more than the work itself, because we often do not esteem that which was so agreeable to us in the process of production.

LUTHER:—Vers. 12-19. (To ver. 15). Therefore it is better to commend the highest government of all things to the God who made us. Let every one perform his duty with all diligence, and execute what God places to his hand; if things do not always turn out as we expected, let us commend them to God. What God gives, that accept; and again, what He prevents, that accept also as good. What we are able to do, that we ought to do; what we cannot do, we must leave undone. The stone that thou art not able to lift, thou must leave lying.

GERLACH (to ver. 17):—If God has disappeared from the efforts of men, a disgust of life appears sooner or later (John iv. 8 ff).

GEIER (to vers. 18, 19):—It is hard for flesh and blood to leave the fruits of its toil to others; but a Christian arms himself against this with the reflection that every thing that he has or does is given to him by God, 1 Cor. iv. 7.

WOHLFARTH (vers. 13-19):—What must we feel it our duty to do, on perceiving that the earth can afford no perfect satisfaction to our demand for happiness?—The wise man is pained on perceiving that all earthly things are vain and unsatisfactory; his eye indeed becomes serious, and his expression reflective. But for that very reason, he hears not only the cry of the grave, but also the words of consolation: "Lift up thy eye, citizen of heaven in the garb of a pilgrim; true as it is, that the world with all its treasures cannot satisfy thy longing for what is lasting and perfect, so foolish is it to seek therein peace and perfect satisfaction."

ZEYSS (vers. 20-23):—This life is full of trouble throughout, with all men and all classes. Why should we not, therefore, ardently long for a better life? (Phil. iii 14).—STARKE:—The travail of soul, by which one obtains salvation through fear and trembling, is therein different from worldly toil, in bearing its profit unto eternal life.

OSIANDER (vers. 24-26):—It is pleasing to God that we should cheerfully enjoy our labor in His fear, so much as our calling may permit it, Ps. cxxviii. 1, 2.

JOACHIM LANGE:—According as man is virtuous or vicious, even his eating and drinking is good or evil. Because the natural man lives either in a state of fleshly security or of servitude, and there is nothing really good in him that avails with God and satisfies the conscience.

STARKE (ver. 26):—Seek above all things to please God by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; else, with all external happiness, thou art still unhappy. The wicked often have worldly goods, and seek in every way to increase them; but they do not have real profit and lasting fruit from them, because their works do not proceed from the faith. He, on the contrary, who possesses the fruits of the Spirit (Gal. v. 22) and is faithful therein, is ever favored by God with greater mercy (Matth. v. 28, 29).

HANSEN (ver. 26):—If we examine it closely, the want of genuine wisdom and pure knowledge is the reason why many do not prosper in the blessings which they possess in the world Men of impure and confused conceptions, who are fettered by dazzling imaginations, must suffer with all their abundance, and lead a miserable life.

HAMANN (ver. 26):—All the vanity, all the toilings of men after wisdom, happiness and rest, which in so many ways lead men to the grave, where ceases all the distinction which they strive to obtain on earth, are not allotted to the pious man by God; they are a curse which sin has laid upon man, but which God will make a blessing to His chosen ones. For these busy, restless creatures gather and heap up for those who are good in God's eyes. And these latter shall gratuitously receive by the sinner's labor what he (the sinner) seeks and finds not, what he labors for and cannot enjoy: wisdom, knowledge, joy.—What is the Divine word, and whence are taken this wisdom, knowledge and joy that in it exist? Are they not honey made by bees in the slain beast? What are the stories that they tell us but examples of sinners' toil, of the vanity and folly into which men have fallen?

HENGSTENBERG (ver. 26):—It is manifest that the expression: "This also is vanity" is not meant in the sense of an accusation of God, but as a cry of warning to human perverseness, that seeks its happiness only there where, according to God's will, it should not be sought.

[For reflections on this and other parts of the book, the reader is referred to MATTHEW HENRY. In no commentary is there to be found a richer treasure of most choice, discriminating and highly spiritual apothegms, rendered most pleasing and ornate by what may be styled a holy humor, or a sanctified wit. They are unsurpassed by any thing in the devout German writers here quoted, but the ready access to the work, for all English readers, renders it unnecessary that the volume should be swelled by inserting them. Besides, among such rich materials, it would not be easy to make a limited selection. Much also of a very rich homiletical character may be obtained from WORDSWORTH.—T. L.].

Digitized by Google

SECOND DISCOURSE.

Of Earthly Happiness, its Impediments and Means of Advancement.

CHAP. 3–5.

A. The substance of earthly happiness or success consists in grateful joy of this life, and a righteous use of it.

CHAP. III. 1–22.

1. The reasons for the temporal restriction of human happiness (consisting in the entire dependence of all human action and effort on an unchangeable, higher system of things).

(VERS. 1–11.)

1 To every *thing there is* a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven:
2 A time to be born, and a time to die; a time to plant, and a time to pluck up *that*
3 *which is* planted; A time to kill, and a time to heal; a time to break down, and a
4 time to build up; A time to weep, and a time to laugh; a time to mourn, and a
5 time to dance; A time to cast away stones, and a time to gather stones together; a
6 time to embrace, and a time to refrain from embracing; A time to get, and a time
7 to lose; a time to keep, and a time to cast away; A time to rend, and a time to
8 sew; a time to keep silence, and a time to speak; A time to love, and a time to
9 hate; a time of war, and a time of peace. What profit hath he that worketh in
10 that wherein he laboureth? I have seen the travail, which God hath given to the
11 sons of men to be exercised in it. He hath made every *thing* beautiful in his time;
also he hath set the world in their heart, so that no man can find out the work that
God maketh from the beginning to the end.

2. The nature of the temporally restricted human happiness.

(VERS. 12–22.)

12 I know that *there is* no good in them, but for *a man* to rejoice, and to do good in
13 his life. And also that every man should eat and drink, and enjoy the good of all
14 his labour; it *is* the gift of God. I know that, whatsoever God doeth, it shall be
for ever: nothing can be put to it, nor any thing taken from it: and God doeth *it*,
15 that *men* should fear before him. That which hath been is now; and that which
16 is to be hath already been; and God requireth that which is past. And moreover
I saw under the sun the place of judgment, *that* wickedness *was* there; and the
17 place of righteousness, *that* iniquity *was* there. I said in mine heart, God shall
judge the righteous and the wicked: for *there is* a time there for every purpose and
18 for every work. I said in mine heart concerning the estate of the sons of men, that
God might manifest them, and that they might see that they themselves are beasts.
19 For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth
them: as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath; so that
20 a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast: for all *is* vanity. All go unto one
21 place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again. Who knoweth the spirit of
man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the
22 earth? Wherefore I perceive that *there is* nothing better, than that a man should
rejoice in his own works; for that *is* his portion: for who shall bring him to see
what shall be after him?

Digitized by Google

[Ver. 1.—זְמָן This is one of the words relied upon to prove the later Hebraic, or Chaldaic, period of the book. We have, however, no right to say that a word running through the Shemitic tongues [as this is found in Arabic, Syriac, Ethiopic, as well as Hebrew] is peculiar to any one of them, or borrowed from any one of them, though circumstances may have made it rare in an early dialect, perhaps on account of a precision of meaning rarely needed, whilst it has become loose and vulgarized in another. It may have been well known in the days of Solomon, though seldom used when the more indefinite עֵת would answer. עֵת means time generally, מוֹעֵד a fixed time (like a yearly festival), זמן in its earlier sense, before it became vulgarized, a time or an *occasion* precisely adapted to a *purpose*. Hence we see its very probable connection with זמם *proponit*, and having also the sense of *binding*, like Arabic زمّ the purpose linked to the due occasion. This suits all the acts following, as more or less the result of purpose in a time proposed. It has good support, too, etymologically, in the final ם changing to the ן as is the tendency in other words. Thus, besides other examples, Lam. iii. 22, according to Rabbi Tanchum, תמם becomes תמן to avoid the harshness of the final ם, making תַּמְנוּ—תַּמְנוּ "*they* are not consumed," or spent [that is, the mercies of the Lord], instead of "*we* are not consumed" We may be assured that the writer did not intend a tautology here. זמן is more precise than עֵת, as it has more of purpose than מוֹעֵד, which relates to things immovable.—T. L.]

[Ver. 18.—עַל־דִּבְרַת. E. V. *On account of* the sons of men. Compare Ps. cx. 4, *after the manner of*. LXX., περὶ λαλιᾶς. Vulgate, simply, *de filiis*. Syriac, על ממללא *after the speech* of men—*more humano—humanly speaking*, which seems the most suitable of any, for reasons given in the Exeget. and Note.—T. L.]

[Ver. 18.—הֵמָּה לָהֶם Literally, *themselves to themselves—in their own estimation*. לְבָרָם, to *prove them—make* it *clear*, literally, (LXX., διακρινεῖ αὐτοὺς. Vulg., *ut probaret*). let them see from themselves, or from their own conduct to themselves, how like beasts they are. This qualified sense is very different from asserting that they are beasts absolutely. The key to it all is in the על דברת above. The writer is speaking *more humano*—the judgment that must be pronounced if men were judged by their own ways.—T. L.]

[Ver. 21.—הָעֹלָה. It can only mean, as it stands in the text, "*that which goeth up*." An effort has been made to give it another turn by pointing ה as interrogative. It is sufficient to say that it is against the text. For other reasons against it, see Exeget. and Note.—T. L.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The unconditional dependence of man on God's government of the world, in all his efforts for happiness, which formed the concluding thought of the preceding discourse (chap. ii. 24-26), now becomes the starting point of a new and independent reflection, in so far as temporal conditions and restrictions of human happiness are deduced therefrom, and its essence is placed in gratefully cheerful enjoyment and a devout use of the earthly blessings bestowed by God. For Divine Providence in its controlling power here below will ever remain obscure and mysterious, so that man, in this its hidden side, can neither alter its course nor observe any other conduct than humble submission and godly fear (vers. 9-11, 14, 15). In the same way the view of the many wrongs in this life, and of the extreme obscurity and concealment of the fate that will overtake individual souls after death, obliges us to cling to the principle of a cheerful, confiding and contented enjoyment of the present (vers. 16-20).—In the more special development of this train of thought, we may either (with VAIHINGER and KEIL) make three principal sections or strophes of the chapter (vers. 1-8; vers. 9-15, and vers. 16-22), or, what appears more logical, two halves; of which each is divided into sections of unequal length. 1. Vers. 1-11 show the reason for the temporal restriction of the earthly happiness of man—*a*, as consisting in the dependence of all human action on time and circumstances (vers. 1-8); *b*, as consisting in the short-sightedness and feebleness of human knowledge in contrast with the endless wisdom and omniscience of God (vers. 9-11). 2. Vers. 12-22 describe human happiness in its nature as temporally restricted and imperfect—*a*, with reference to the awe-inspiring immutability of those decrees of God which determine human fate (vers. 12-15); *b*, with reference to the secret ways adopted by Divine justice, in rewarding the good and punishing the evil in this world, and still more in the world beyond (vers. 16-22).

2. *First Division, first strophe.*—Ver. 1-8. Every human action and effort are subject to the law of time and temporal change.—**To every thing there is a season, and a time to every purpose under heaven.**—"Every thing," namely, every thing that man undertakes or does on earth; a very general expression, more clearly defined by the following כָּל־חֵפֶץ every business, every undertaking, but more clearly illustrated in the subsequent verses in a number of special examples.—זְמָן lit., precision, limitation, indicates in later style (Neh. ii. 6; Esth. ix. 27, 31), a *certain period*, a *term* for any thing, whilst the more common עֵת (*time*) signifies a division of time in general.—Ver. 2. **A time to be born and a time to die.**—This is the original text, as is the same turn until the 8th verse.* The Sept. and the Vulg. express this construction genitively (καιρὸς τοῦ τέκειν κ. τ. λ., *tempus nascendi, etc.*) The word לָלֶדֶת does not stand for the passive לְהִוָּלֵד to be born (Vulg., LUTHER, EWALD, GESENIUS, ELSTER), but like all the following infinitives, is to be taken actively: to bear. The constant usage of the Old Testament favors this rendering with reference to the verb יָלַד, and also the circumstance that with לֶדֶת an un-

*[ZÖCKLER renders "*its* time to be born and *its* time to die," making it all dependent (this and the following verses) on the first "every thing has *its* time." On זְמָן see Text notes.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

dertaking (חֵפֶץ), a conscious and intentional action or business is to be named, which can only be said of the maternal part of the act of human birth, and not of that of the child. Death fittingly follows closely to birth. By this juxtaposition of the acts which mark the entrance into life and the exit from it, the whole arena within which the subsequent actions are performed, is from the beginning "marked by its fixed limits" (HITZIG). **A time to plant and a time to pluck up that which is planted.**—For the affinity between these two ideas and that of birth and death, comp. Prov. xii. 12; Ps. i. 37; xxxvii. 35 f.; xcii. 13 f.; cxxviii. 3; Dan. iv. 11, 20; Matth. iii. 8-10; vii. 17 f.; xv. 18. לַעֲקוֹר probably from Chald.* עִקַּר "root," means originally to root out, to unroot, but is always elsewhere in the O. T. used metaphorically, *e. g.*, of the destruction of cities (Zeph. ii. 4), of striking down horses or oxen, and making them useless by severing the sinews of their hind feet (Gen. xlix. 6).—Ver. 3.—**A time to kill and a time to heal.**—A negative thought here precedes, as also in the subsequent clauses, till the first of ver. 5, after which, until the end, the positive or negative idea alternately precedes. "To kill" (הֲרוֹג lit., cut down, or stab) indicates the inflicting of the very wounds whose healing the following verb points out.—Ver. 4. **A time to weep,** *etc.*—לִבְכּוֹת appears only on account of similarity of sound to be placed immediately after לִבְנוֹת, as in the following clause: רְקוֹד to leap, to dance, appears to be chosen on account of its like sounding ending as a contrast to סְפוֹד to lament (κόπτεσθαι, plangere).†—Ver. 5. **A time to cast away stones, and a time to gather stones together.**—In this first expression there is, of course, no allusion to the destruction of the temple, of which, according to Mark xiii. 2, not one stone shall remain upon another (as HENGSTENBERG and others think), and quite as little to the stoning of malefactors, or to the throwing of stones on the fields of enemies, according to 2 Kings iii. 19, 25 (HITZIG, ELSTER, *etc.* But הַשְׁלִיךְ אֲבָנִים is here identical with סַקֵּל "to free from stones," Isa. v. 2; lxii. 10, and alludes therefore to the gathering and throwing away of stones from the fields, vineyards, *etc.*; whilst the latter expression naturally means the collecting of stones for the construction of houses (as VAIHINGER justly observes).—**A time to embrace, and a time to refrain from embracing.**—Whether the connection of the preceding expressions with חֲבוֹק to embrace, is really effected by the fact that one embraces with the hand the stone to be cast, as HITZIG supposes, is very doubtful. At all events, however, חבק means the embrace of love (Prov. v. 20), and the intensive in the second rank is purposely placed there to indicate that every excess of sexual intercourse is injurious.—Ver. 6. **A time to get, and a time to lose.**—אַבֵּד as a contrast to בַּקֵּשׁ must clearly here mean to lose (or also to be lost, to abstain from getting, VAIHINGER) although it every where else means to destroy, to ruin; for in all the remaining clauses of the series, the second verb asserts directly the opposite of the first. In contrast to the unintentional losing, the corresponding verb הַשְׁלִיךְ of the second clause then indicates an intentional casting away of a possession to be preserved (2 Kings vii. 15; Ezek. xx. 8).—**A time to rend and a time to sew.**—One might here suppose the rending of garments on hearing sad tidings (1 Sam. i. 11; iii. 39; Job i. 20; ii. 12; Matth. xxvi. 63), and again the sewing up of the garments that had been thus rent as a sign of grief. And also by the following "to keep silence" one would first think of the mournful silence of the sorrowing (Gen. xxxiv. 5; Job ii. 13).—Ver. 8. **A time to love,** *etc.*—Love and hatred, war and peace, forming an inter-relation with each other, are now connected with the contents of the preceding verse by the intermediary thought of the agreeable and disagreeable, or of well and evil doing.

3. *First Division, second strophe.*—Vers. 9-11. In consequence of the temporal character of all worldly action and effort, human knowledge is also especially ineffective and feeble in presence of the unsearchable ruling of the Eternal One.—**What profit hath he that worketh in that wherein he laboureth?**—That is, what profit do all the various, antagonistic actions, of which a number has just been quoted (ver. 3-8) bring to man? The question is one to which a decidedly negative answer is expected, and draws therefore a negative result from the preceding reflection: There is nothing lasting, no continuous happiness here below.—Ver. 10. **I have seen the travail,** *etc.*—Comp. chap. i. 13. This verse has simply a transitional meaning; it prepares us for the more accurate description given in ver. 11 of the inconstant, transitory and feeble condition of human knowledge and effort, in the presence of the unsearchable wisdom of God.—Ver. 11. **He hath made every thing beautiful in his time.**—The principal emphasis rests on the word בְּעִתּוֹ "in his time," as the connection with the foregoing vers. 1-8 shows.

* The root, though not frequent, is common enough in Hebrew for this purpose; why go to the Chaldaic?

† [All such infinitives as *rekodh* and *sephodh* have a like rhyming. The fact that accounts for the choice here is rather the similarity of primary sense which is found in verbs of dancing and mourning. All passions in early times were expressed by a violence of outward action, such as beating the breast, rending the garments, rolling on the earth, *etc.*, that in these colder days of the world's old age would be deemed utterly extravagant. Thus, in the Greek κόπτεσθαι, mentioned by ZÖCKLER, Homer's προπροκυλίνδεσθαι, *Iliad* XXII. 221. Hebrew סָפוֹד primarily to smite the breast. We still find traces of it in modern words, though almost worn out. Thus our word *plaint* is but a feeble echo of the Latin *plangere*. In the Syriac this same root, here rendered to *dance*, is used in the Aphel conjugation for mourning. Thus in that children's ditty, or play upon words, recited by our Saviour, Matth. xi. 17, the word, in the Peschito Version, for mourning is אַרְקֵד, for dancing רַקֵּד, in Roman letters, *arked, raked*. A play upon words of this kind is proof that the gospel (of Matthew at least) in its oral form before any writing, was Aramaic, and that our Saviour spoke it. Such children's ditties are very tenacious, and it must have been of long standing. The play upon words that it gives could not have been original in the Greek, though afterwards early translated.—T. L.]

God has arranged all things beautifully in this life (comp. Gen. i. 31), but always only "in his time," always only so that it remains beautiful and good for man during its restricted time, but after that becomes an evil for him; therefore always only so that the glory of this earth soon reaches its end.—**Also he hath set the world in their heart.**—(Zöckler's rendering, *eternity in their heart*).—That is, in *the hearts of men;* for the suffix in בְּלִבָּם refers to the children of men in ver. 11, whilst in the subsequent clause the *individual* man (הָאָדָם) is placed opposite to the one God. This clause clearly holds a rising relation to the contents of the preceding: God has here below not only arranged all things well for man in this temporal period; He has even given them eternity in their hearts. This is clearly the author's train of thought. With eternity given to the heart of man, he also means the knowledge of God's eternal nature and rule, innate even in the natural man, that *notitia Dei naturalis insita s, innata*, which Paul, Rom. i. 19 f., describes as an intellectual perception of God's eternal power and divinity, peculiar as such to man, and which develops itself in the works of creation. It appears as well from the word בְּלִבָּם (heart, here in the same sense as i. 13–17, *etc.*), as from the following: "So that no man can find out," that it is substantially this natural knowledge of God, namely, something belonging to the realm of human conception, a moral good from the sphere of intellectual life,—that the author means by the expression הָעֹלָם (consequently not simply the character of immortality)—although he must have considered this closely connected with the natural conception of God, according to chap. xii. 7. For this restrictive clause clearly expresses a restriction of human nature in an intellectual sense, an inability to find, which is equal to an inability to know. But as certainly as this inability to know refers to the extent and limits of Divine action, so certainly will also the knowledge of the human heart, expressed by הָעֹלָם be a religious knowledge referring to God and Divine things. Therefore we would reject as opposed to the text those explanations of הָעֹלָם which give to this expression the sense of "world" (Vulg., Luther, Umbreit, Ewald, Elster, *etc.*), or "worldly-mindedness" (Gesenius, Knobel), or "worldly wisdom," "judgment" (Gaab, Spohn); also Hitzig, who, however, contends for עֶלֶם instead of עוֹלָם. And besides the connection, the style of the entire Old Testament and of this book is opposed to this rendering; according to them עוֹלָם is always eternity (comp. Eccles. i. 4, 10; ii. 16; iii. 14; ix. 6; xii. 5) and first receives the signification of "world macrocosmos" in the literature of the Talmud.—**So that no man can find out the work that God maketh from the beginning to the end.**—That is, this one restriction is laid on this human conception of the Eternal One, that it can never obtain a perfect and truly adequate insight into the Divine plan of the world, but rather, is only able to perceive the unsearchable ways and incomprehensible decrees of God, fragmentarily and in a glass darkly (Rom. ii. 32; 1 Cor. xiii. 12). מִבְּלִי אֲשֶׁר is here clearly in the sense of *only that*, "*except that*," therefore synonymous with אֶפֶס כִּי formerly used for this (Amos ix. 8; Judges iv. 9; 2 Sam. xii. 14). Comp. Ewald, *Lehrbuch*, § 354 *b*. The deviating significations Vulg., Gesenius: "*ita ut non;*" (Sept., Herzfeld: ὅπως μή: "in order not," Knobel: "without that;" Hitzig, Umbreit, Hahn: "without which," *etc.*) are not only inconsonant to the text, but without sufficient linguistic authority, so far as regards the signification of מִבְּלִי אֲשֶׁר.*—The author is here silent in re-

*[Ver. 11. The strong objection to the interpretation of Gesenius, De Wette, and Knobel, is that the New Testament use of the word *world* for *worldliness, love of the world*, is unknown to the Hebrew Scriptures. Equally unwarranted are Hitzig and Stuart in first transforming עוֹלָם into עֶלֶם (not found in Hebrew in any such sense, but supposed to be equivalent to the Arabic عِلم) and then rendering it "*knowledge*, without which," *etc.* The Arabic sense of the verb علم *to know*, is later than the primary Hebrew, to be *hidden* or *obscure*, though coming from it by a seeming law of contraries peculiar to the Shemitic tongues; it is *knowledge as discovery*, or *science strictly*, or *the hidden found.* It is only in the Arabic عالَم *mundus*, equal to עוֹלָם, that the old Hebrew primary appears. Besides, this view of Hitzig and Stuart is at war with the מִבְּלִי אֲשֶׁר which they have no right to render *without which*. The proper way of expressing that, in Hebrew, would be by placing אֲשֶׁר first, and following it with the personal suffix and a different particle, אֲשֶׁר מִבַּלְעָדָיו (*which* without *it* they cannot, *etc.*). A plausible rendering is, "he hath put *obscurity* in their hearts;" but this, though agreeing with the primary sense of the verb, never occurs as a sense of the noun. The view of Zöckler, substantially agreeing with one given by Geier, that עוֹלָם here, or eternity regarded as in the heart of man, refers to the natural human recognition of the eternal power and Godhead, as spoken of by Paul. Rom. i. 20, presents an admirable meaning if it can be sustained. It may be said that it is giving עולם too much of an abstract sense, but it is certain that the writer intends here no common thought, and, therefore, the word employed may be fairly extended, philologically, to its utmost limits. It can hardly be reconciled, however, with the מִבְּלִי אֲשֶׁר which Zöckler, without any other warrant than his own assertion, makes equivalent to אפס כי and then renders it *nur dass nicht. only that not*, thus turning it into a mere exceptive limitation, as is also done by Tremellius and Grotius: *excepto quod non.* There are no Scriptural examples of such use of מבלי or מבלי אשר, and this would be enough, even if every reader did not feel that there is something in it at war with the whole spirit of this profound declaration. In this compound particle מבלי the מ is negative, implying *hinderance*, and intensifying the negation in the other part. The LXX. have, therefore, properly rendered it ὅπως μή. *that not*, or rather, *in such a way that not* (ὅπως, in distinction from ἵνα, referring to the *manner* of accomplishing, rather than to the *purpose* itself). "He hath *so* presented it to their minds,

Digitized by Google

spect to the profoundest reason why man cannot thoroughly know and comprehend the works and reign of God, that is the interruption of the original pure harmony of his Spirit by means of sin; he is so because he would seem rather, as it were, purposely to presuppose this fact than emphatically to express it.

4. *Second Division, first strophe.* Vers. 12-15. Human happiness is temporally restricted, consisting mainly in the cheerful enjoyment and proper use of the moment, because it depends on the immutable decrees of divine laws, claiming fear and humble submission, rather than bold hope and effort.—**I know that there is no good in them**—namely, in the "children of men," (ver. 10) to whom the בְּלִבָּם ver. 11 already referred. בָּם "in them with them,"* is mainly synonymous with "for them;" comp. ii. 24. יָדַעְתִּי is literally, "I have perceived, and I know in consequence thereof;" it means the past, in its result reaching into the future, here also as in ver. 14.—**But for a man to rejoice and do good in this life.**—Together with the gratefully cheerful enjoyment of life's goods, the "doing good" is here named more distinctly than in chap. ii. 26, as a principal condition and occupation of human happiness. And therewith is also meant, as that passage shows, and as appears still more definitely from the parallels in Ps. xxxiv. 14; xxxvii. 8; Isa. xxxviii. 8, *etc.*, not merely benevolence, but uprightness, fulfilment of the divine commands (comp. xii. 13). For the meaning of עֲשׂוֹת טוֹב in the sense of "be of good cheer," to be merry (Aben Ezra, Luther, de Wette, Knobel, Hitzig, *etc.*) there is not a single philological proof; for in chap. ii. 24; iii. 22; v. 7, *etc.*, there are similar phrases, but still materially different from this one, which express the sense of being merry." †—בְּחַיָּיו lit., "*in his life*" refers again to the singular הָאָדָם, ver. 11, so that in this verse the singular and the plural use of this verb alternates as in the preceding.—Ver. 13. **And also that every man should eat and drink,** *etc.*, **it is the gift of God.** Clearly the same thought as in chap. ii. 24, 25. The particle וְגַם, introducing still another object of perception to יָדַעְתִּי besides that named already in ver. 12, refers to the whole sentence. As to the peculiar construction of the first conditional clause without אִם, or other particle, see Ewald, § 357, c.—Ver. 14. **I know that whatever God doeth it shall be forever.** Herein it appears that all human action is dependent on the eternal law of God, and that especially all cheerful, undisturbed enjoyment of the blessings of this life, depends on the decrees of this highest law-giver and ruler of the world. Comp. the theoretical description of the ever constant course of divine laws in chap. i. 4-11.—*Nothing can be put to it, nor anything taken from it.* To it (עָלָיו) namely, to all that everlastingly abiding order which God

---

that they cannot, *etc.* So the Targum דלא the Syriac איך דלא, Rashi כדי שלא, Aquila ὡς οὐχ, Vulgate, Pagnin. Drus. Merc. *ut non.*

That other idea, however, of the word as *world*, *world-time*, *world-plan* (see ver. 14), which has been so fully dwelt upon in the Excursus on the Olamic Words, p. 44, *harmonises* perfectly with the immediate context, and the whole tenor of the deeper reflections contained in this book: The *world-problem* hath God so put into their hearts (literally, *given* in their heart, נתן בלבם)—presented to their minds,—or, as the Vulgate well expresses it, *tradidit disputationi eorum*, that, *etc.* Whether we take it in the cosmical or olamic sense, what a comment upon this is furnished by the ancient schools, Greek, Egyptian, Persian, or Oriental generally, in their endless cosmogonical disputations on the world, its first matter, its first moving principles, its origin,—on the question of its duration, whether it had a beginning or would ever have an end, whether it had any thing immutable (τὸ ὄντως ὄν) or was ever phenomenal and flowing,—whether there were more worlds than one, either in time or space—in short, whence it came, how it existed, and what was it all for, or what did it truly mean. These disputations were much older than Thales, and Solomon must have *heard* of them, at least, even if unacquainted particularly with all, or any, of the theories held. Let any one see, especially, how these disputations of the early ante-Socratic Greek schools are summed up by Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, I. 14: τῶν τε περὶ τῆς τῶν πάντων φύσεως μεριμνώντων κ. τ. λ., and he will well appreciate the force of the strong language: "so that they cannot find it out to the end from the beginning,"—especially as confirmed by the still more striking declaration, viii. 17: "yea, though a wise man (a philosopher) say that he knows it, yet shall he not be able to find it out." In the *time* sense, or the olamic sense of the word world, it is still more clear, especially when regarded as the great olam, or *world period*, or world idea (ver. 14), compared with that list of brief passing times mentioned before as belonging to "things beneath the sun." The writer had presented special seasons belonging to the chief occupations and events of human life—a time to plant, a time to love, a time to hate, to mourn, to rejoice, *etc.* The fitness of these man could study and perceive, but the great all-containing time, the encircling eternity or world time, who could understand.—God had so presented this to the human thought, the human mind, that though it could reason well of passing events, it "could not find out the end from the beginning." It could not discover the world idea (ver. 14), that higher wisdom than the natural from which it all depended, nor that deeper wisdom than nature to which it was all as a means to an end. Even in its highest state, taking the form of the most lauded science, it was only the study of links (see remarks, Int., Met. Ver.), of adaptations to adaptations, among which it could never find beginnings nor ends. Something greater might be divined by faith, but otherwise, it was as unsearchable as the wisdom so anxiously inquired after, Job xxviii.: "The deep saith it is not in me," *etc.* It was true even of physical knowledge, that it could not find out its own limits, when taken comparatively. The individual man occupies but a point in the great world cycle. As *things go round*, he sees, or may see, "how they are all fair in their season," each fitting to the one next, and so on, as far as he may carry his researches; but what it is *all* about, or what it *all* means, that no science of nature can reveal to him. His angle of vision, even with the mightiest aid it has ever had, or may expect to have, is too small to take in more than a very few degrees, or a very few seconds of a degree, in the mighty arc we are traversing, or have passed during the longest known times that either history, or the observation of nature, has revealed to us. The thought is not beyond what may be ascribed to Koheleth, with his grand cyclical ideas, and nothing could be in better harmony with the contexts, or the peculiar particles by which they are united. There are some rich homiletical thoughts arising from such a view of verses 11th, 14th, and 15th, but they belong in another place.—T. L.]

* [It is by no means clear that the pronoun in בָּם refers to *persons*. The most natural connection would be with the *things* mentioned above, and all summed up in the אֶת הַכֹּל of ver. 11: "No good in these things except to rejoice, *etc.*" The ם in בְּלִבָּם would not, grammatically, sever this, since it does not belong to the main assertion.—T. L.

† עֲשׂוֹת טוֹב, has not here, as Zöckler well says, the sense of "being merry;" neither can it be taken as denoting *beneficence*; or even good conduct (doing the divine commands), in a general moral sense. It strictly means *to do well*, in the sense of prosperity, to have success—corresponding to the Greek εὖ πράττειν, rather than to εὖ ποιεῖν, or εὖ πάσχειν.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

makes, to all those eternally valid enactments of the Most High. For the construction אֵין לְהוֹסִיף, Comp. EWALD, § 237, c. For the sentence: Sirach, xviii. 5; Revelation xxii. 18.—**And God doeth it, that men should fear before Him.**—And this by those very immutable laws of his world-ruling activity, on which men, with all their deeds and destiny, depend; comp. ix. 12; 2 Cor. v. 11; and for the construction: Ezek. xxxvi. 27; Rev. xiii. 15. As in those places, so also here, the expression "doeth it that," does not mean "in order that," but "effecting that" "making it to be so," accomplishing. By יָרֵא "to fear," KOHELETH does not mean a feeling of terror and horror, but rather that sacred feeling of holy awe which we call reverence; but nevertheless "he here considers this reverence not as a beneficent blissful sensation, but rather as a depressing feeling of the vanity of man in contrast with the boundless fulness of the power of God, as an inward shudder at the bonds of the divine decree, which envelop him, and by which, in his conception, every spiritual movement is restricted in advance to a certain measure," (ELSTER).—Ver. 15. **That which hath been is now, and that which is to be hath already been.**—(כְּבָר הוּא) *i. e.*, is already long present, comes of old (not exactly; is something old, as HITZIG translates, turning the adverb into a substantive). The second clause containing אֲשֶׁר לִהְיוֹת says, literally, as in the English rendering: "that which is to be." For the sentence comp. i. 9; vi. 10, and especially Job xiv. 5; Ps. cxxxix. 15, where still more clearly than here, is expressed the predestination of all the destinies of man by God.—**And God requireth that which is past.** (Lit., and God seeketh that which was crowded out). He again brings forth that which the vicissitudes of time had already crowded out, or pushed back into the past; *Deus instaurat, quod abiit* (*Vulgate*). This signification alone of יְבַקֵּשׁ אֶת נִרְדָּף is in accordance with the context, not that given in the *Sept. Syriac*, TARG., HENGSTENBERG, *etc.*, according to which the allusion here would be to the divine consolation and gracious visitation of the persecuted, (Matt. v. 10; Luke xix. 10, *etc.*).

5. *Second Division, second strophe.* Vers. 16–22. The restriction of human happiness appears especially in the numerous cases of unsatisfactory, indeed, apparently unjust, distribution of happiness and unhappiness, according to the moral worth and merit of men, as this mundane life reveals it, as well as in the uncertainty regarding the kind of reward in the world beyond, which ever exists in this world below. **And moreover I saw under the sun.**—The "moreover" (עוֹד) refers to ver. 12, and therefore introduces something which comes as a new conception to the one there described (and also in ver. 14 f.), and which holds the same relation to that as the special to the general.—**The place of judgment**, *etc.* Lit., at the place of judgment; for מְקוֹם here, and in the subsequent clause is strictly taken, not as the object of "I saw," but, as the accents indicate, is an independent nominative (or locative)—an abrupt construction which produces a certain solemn impression well adapted to the excited feelings of the poet. מִשְׁפָּט and צֶדֶק judgment and righteousness, differ materially as objective and subjective, or as the judgment that must serve the judge as the absolute rule for his decisions, and as the practical judgment in the life of the normal man; the latter expression is, therefore, largely synonymous with "innocence," virtue. In contrast to both ideas, KOHELETH calls הָרֶשַׁע "the evil," "the crime," thinking of course, in the first place, of objective, and in the second place of subjective wrong, or, the first time, of crime as a wicked judge practices it, the second time, of the wantonness of the wicked in general.—Ver. 17. **God shall judge the righteous and the wicked.**—He will appoint to them, therefore, that "judgment" which, according to ver. 16, is so frequently in human life, either not to be found at all, or not in the right place; comp. chap. v. 7; Deut. i. 17; Ps. lxxxii. 1 ff.—**For there is a time there for every purpose, and every work.**—That is, in heaven above, with God, the just judge, there is a time to judge every good and every evil deed of men. שָׁם, pointing upwards, (as in Gen. xlix. 24, מִשָּׁם) and עֵת, here as elsewhere, is the "time of judicial decision, the term;" comp. chap. ix. 11. 12, as well as the New Testament ἡμέρα, 1 Cor. iii. 13; iv. 2, *etc.* Others read שָׂם instead of שָׁם: "He has set a time for everything," (HOUBIGANT, VAN DER PALM, DÖDERLEIN, HITZIG, ELSTER), but which is quite as unnecessary as the temporal signification of שָׁם=time, *in tempore judicii* (HIERONYMUS), or as referring the expression to the earth as the seat of the tribunal here meant (HAHN), or as the explanation of שָׂם according to the Talmud, in the sense of "appraising, taxing" (FURST, VAIHINGER: "And He appraises every action"), or, finally, as EWALD's parenthesizing of the words כִּי עֵת לְכָל־חֵפֶץ whereby the sentence acquires the following form: "God will judge the just and the unjust (for there is a time for everything), and will judge of every deed."*—Ver. 1–8. **Concerning**

*[שָׁם, ver. 17, *there.* This little word coming in such connection is most suggestive. The thought presented, though so unobtrusively expressed, is, in reality, one of the modulating key notes of this singular book. The connection between this verse, 17th, and the commencement of the chapter is unmistakable. In contrast with the particular times and occasions there mentioned, there is here placed the great time, the great olam, to which all the particular times have reference, and in which they are all to be judged. For *there*, too, unto every purpose, and for every work, לְכָל־חֵפֶץ וְעַל כָּל מַעֲשֶׂה there is an עֵת, a time appointed. It immediately leads the mind away from this subsolar state (תַּחַת הַשָּׁמֶשׁ) to that higher world that more remote state, or *world beyond* (Jenseits) to which all has reference, and which seems to be constantly in the writer's mind as an *idea*, but without locality, or specific manner, or any assigned or assignable chronology,—as though it were something he firmly believed, but could not define, or even distinctly conceive. It is the basis of all his contemplations, the ground on which he so firmly rests in the concluding declaration of the book. שָׁם may mean any

Digitized by Google

the sons of men, that God might manifest them. As the introductory words: "I said in my heart," connect the verse with the preceding one, it assumes the same relation to ver. 16 as to that, and to עַל־דִּבְרַת בְּנֵי הָאָדָם, and, therefore, the principal thought of this 16th verse is to be thus supplied: "On account of the sons of men, does this unfinished toleration of wrong on earth exist, in order that God may manifest (try) them, *i. e.*, grant them their free decision for or against His truth (comp. Rev. xxii. 11). For בָּרַר, *to test, prove*, compare chap. ix. 1; Dan. xi. 35, as well as the Rabbinic style, according to which this verb means "to sift," "to winnow" (SCHEBIIT, 5, 9). לְבָרָם הָאֱלֹהִים is lit. "for God proving them," a somewhat harsh construction, but which has its analogy in Isa. xxix. 23.—**That they might see**, namely, the sons of men, for whose instruction the test is indeed instituted; since God, for His part, needs not to see it, for He knows in advance of what men are made, (Ps. ciii. 14).—**That they themselves are beasts.** Men are here declared to be beasts, that is, not better than the beasts of the field, not on account of their conduct (as Ps. lxxiii. 22), but on account of their final dissolution, and their inevitable sinking under the dominion of death; comp. ver. 19 f.; chap. ix. 12, and also Hab. i. 14; Ps. xlix. 20. Therefore, not the brutal disposition, and the lawlessly wild conduct of the natural mind (HITZIG, ELSTER, *etc.*), but his subjection to the rule of death, and the curse of vanity (Rom. v. 12 ff.; viii. 19 ff.), furnish the reason for this placing our race on a level with the brutes (as LUTHER, HENGSTENBERG, VAIHINGER correctly assume).—"**They themselves,**" *i. e.*, apart from God's redeeming influence, which can finally secure to their spirit eternal life and blessedness notwithstanding the subjection of the body to death (chap. xii. 7, 13).—לָהֶם casts the action back on the subject, and serves to bring out this latter with special emphasis, comp. Gen. xii. 1; Amos ii. 14; Job vi. 19, *etc.* According to EWALD, § 315, *a.*—הֵמָּה לָהֶם is a playful intensity of the sense something like the Latin *ipsissimi;* but EWALD can quote no other proof than this very passage.—Ver. 19 affords a still further illustration of the comparison between men and beasts, which extends to ver. 21 inclusive, with the view of forcibly expressing the uncertainty of the destiny of the former in and after their death.—**For that which befalleth the sons of men, befalleth beasts.** (*Lit. Ger. For chance are the sons of men, and chance the beasts*); this because they are both equally under the dominion of chance (מִקְרֶה, as chap. ii. 14, 15), because the lot of both is inevitably marked out for them *from without*, (HENGSTENBERG). But it is arbitrary to refer this appellation "*chance*," simply to the beginning of life in men and beasts, as "the issues of a blind fate," (HITZIG) and it is in opposition to the remark immediately following: (in the German) "and one fate, or chance, overtakes them all;" which shows that the end of both is death, striking them all the same inexorable blow; on which account it is, by a bold metaphor, called "chance."—**As the one dieth, so dieth the other,** that is, in external appearance, which is authoritative for the author's present judgment; for he is now disregarding that life which exists for man after death, as he simply wishes to call attention to the transitory character of the earthly existence of our race.—**Yea, they have all one breath, so that man has no pre-eminence above a beast.** רוּחַ is here as in ver. 21, not spirit, in the stricter sense, but breath, or force of life, the animating and organizing principle in general, and is therefore, in that more extended sense, applicable to men as well as beasts, as in Gen. vii. 21 f.; Ps. civ. 29, and chap. viii. 8, of this book. On account of the broader latitude of the conception רוח, "breath," the following remark, that man has no preëminence (מוֹתָר) over the beast, is meant not in the sense of an absolute, but simply of a relative equality of both natures; the poet will place both on the same level only in reference to the external identity of the close of their life (and not as KNOBEL supposes, who here thinks materialism openly taught).* Comp.

great occasion, crisis, or eventuality, as well as *place*. Comp. Gen. xi. 9; Ps. cxxxiii. 3. As used here, it strongly calls to mind the Greek ἐκεῖ, and the manner in which the poets employ it to express a similar indefinite contrast with the present state or world in like characteristic manner styled ἐνθάδε, here, *Diesseits* (*this side of time*). Thus Medea (1069) says to her children, εὐδαιμονοῖτον, as though giving them the usual maternal blessing, and then suddenly checks herself with the thought of what is coming—

ἀλλ' ἘΚΕῚ· τὰ δ' ἘΝΘΆΔΕ
Πατὴρ ἀφείλετ'—

"but THERE; all HERE your Father's hand has taken quite away." *There* in that other world, or time, or state. The expression seems to have little or no direct connection with their mythology, or the fabled regions of Hades. but rather to have come from this innate idea of the human soul, or the moral necessity that gives birth to the thought of some other world and time than this, but without known chronology or locality. Things must be balanced: somehow, and somewhere, and at sometime, the equation must be completed. For a similar use of ἐκεῖ and ἐνθάδε, compare Æschylus Iketides 230, *Pindar Olymp. II.* 105, and, especially, *Plato Repub.*, 330 D., where both terms are used, with mythological reference indeed, but carrying the same general and most impressive thought of an after world, or time of judgment, as a correspondence to this: οἱ τε γὰρ λεγόμενοι μῦθοι περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἅιδου, ὡς τὸν ἘΝΘΆΔΕ ἀδικήσαντα δεῖ ἘΚΕῖ διδόναι δίκην κ. τ. λ.: "For the myths that are told us respecting Hades (or the unseen), how that the wrong doer HERE must make compensation THERE,—myths once derided,—now disturb the soul with fear lest they be true." This striking passage, taken in its remarkable connection, shows that there was, in the old Greek mind, that same fear of "a judgment to come," of something awful after this world, that is now felt by the common modern mind. It was before Christianity. It created myths, and was not created by them.—It is the voice of conscience, independent of all mythologies, but showing itself in all their varied forms, as though, without some such idea, religion would have no existence.—T. L.]

*[The key to the right interpretation of the whole passage, chap. iii. 18–21, together with a complete defence to the charge of materialism which Knobel brings against Koheleth, is found in the phrases עַל דִּבְרַת, לְבָרָם, and הֵמָּה לָהֶם, in verse 18 above. The first is rendered in our version, "on account of;" Vulgate has simply *de* (*de filiis hominum*); lxx. περὶ λαλιᾶς υἱῶν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ("concerning the talk of men"); So the Syriac עַל ממללא ("according to the speech of the sons of men").—that is "speaking after the manner of men," speaking humanly, or *more humano*. The other rendering, "on account of," or "by reason of" (which is nearer to the sense of the phrase elsewhere), comes to very much the same thing, or expresses the same general idea. See Ps. cx. 4, where it is rendered "after the manner of." It is an intimation that the lan-

Digitized by Google

also the dogmatical and ethical section.—Ver. 20. **All go unto one place**, *i. e.*, men and beasts; for they both alike become dust, as they were formed of dust. The following clause shows that by the "one place," is meant the earth as a common burial place for the bodies of men and beasts; and not Scheol, "the house appointed for all living," (Job xxx. 23).—**All are of the dust, and all turn to dust again.** Comp. Gen. iii. 19; Ps. civ. 29; cvii. 4; Sirach xl. 11; xli. 10. All these passages, like this one, regard man solely as a material being, and, in so far, assert a perfect likeness in his death to that of beasts. The question whether the spirit of man shares this fate, is yet unanswered. The following verse refers to that, not to afford a definite answer, but to affirm the impossibility of an answer founded on sense-experience.—Ver. 21. **For who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward?**—The interrogative form of this and the following clause, is unconditionally required by the structure of the sentence and the context. Therefore הָעֹלָה is not, as in the masoretic text, to be written with the ה *articuli*, but with the ה *interrogativum*, (thus, הַעֹלָה) and the same way in the following, or הַיֹּרֶדֶת. The construction is therefore not, as in Joel ii. 14, that of an affirmative question, but rather that of a doubtful one, expressing uncertainty. As in Ps. xc. 11, or above in chap. ii. 19, מִי יוֹדֵעַ ה points out that the matter is difficult of conception, not, at first view, clear and apparent, but rather eluding the direct observation of sense. This verse does not, therefore, assert an absolute ignorance (as KNOBEL supposes), but rather some knowledge regarding the fate of the spirit in the world beyond, though wanting certainty and external evidence. Concerning the return of the spirit of man to its Divine Giver, it maintains that no one, in this world, has ever seen or survived it, just as emphatically, and in like manner, as John [i. 18 and 1 Epist. iv. 12] asserts of the sight of God, that it has never been granted to any man. A denial of the immortality of the spirit of man, as an object of inward certainty of faith [as later testimony from this standpoint of faith shows, chap. xii. 7], is as little to be found in this passage as in the assertion of John, "no one has ever seen God," is to be found a doubt of the fact, certain to faith, of the future beholding of God (1 John iii. 2). Ignoring this state of the case, the Masora, in order to destroy the supposed skeptical sense of the passage, has punctuated the twice repeated ה, before עלה and before ירדת as articles, and so reached the thought maintained by many moderns (GEIER, DATHE, ROSENMUELLER, HENGSTENBERG, HAHN): "Who knoweth the spirit of man, that which goeth upward? and the spirit of the beast, that which goeth downward to the earth?" The only just conception, according to connection and structure, is that given by the Sept., Vulg., Chald., and Syr., which not only the "rationalistic exegesis," as HENGSTENBERG supposes, but also LUTHER, STARKE, MICHAELIS, ELSTER, and many others, have adopted, who are very far from attributing to the Preacher skeptical or materialistic tendencies.*—Ver. 22.

---

guage of the following verses is hypothetical, or adapted to a supposed state of things, such as Koheleth had called up before his own mind, that is, "said in his heart." It is the language of human action. The Arabian rhetoricians and critics have a peculiar phrase for it, لسان الحال. "the tongue of the condition," or "the case speaking." See RABBI TANCHUM, *Arabic Commentary on Lamentations*, III. 36; also marg. note Genesis, p. 361. This they get from the Rabbinical grammarians and interpreters who have a similar Hebrew phrase, לשון הדבר, for such cases as this. All the language following, which seems to represent man as having no supremacy over the beast, is affected by this hypothetical impression. It is man's judgment upon himself as pronounced by his own conduct. The writer, in this "*talking to his heart*," takes men as they are, as they appear, fallen, worldly, sensual, animal. It is the language of their lives. It is all that could be gathered by one who confined himself to this view, or who had nothing to go by but the observation of the general human conduct,—the way of the world. Such an interpretation is fortified by what follows in the same verse: "that God might prove them," לברם האלהים, "make it clear to them" by their own experience, their own ways, how much like beasts they are, or rather, how much like beasts they live and die, though He had created them in His own image. It calls up Ps. xlix. 12, 20: "Man that is *in honor*, and understandeth it not, is like the beasts that perish." In both cases it may be said: "this their way is their folly," and we have no more right to charge Epicureanism, or materialism, on the one passage than on the other. The same impression of hypothetical speaking is produced, and, perhaps, still more strongly, by the pronouns המה להם, at the close of that verse. Zöckler's opinion that this is simply an intensive phrase equivalent to *ipsissimi* is not satisfactory. The Rationalist Hitzig comes nearer to the true view of these pronouns. He connects them with ברם, to prove them," to "try" (or *test them*), to let them see (*zur Einsicht zu bringen*) how like beasts they are. So Stuart: "That they might see for themselves." As is often the case, however, in Hebrew, the sense is best brought out by the most literal interpretation the words will bear: "Themselves to themselves," or, "to let them see that they are beasts, *themselves to themselves*;" not in their treatment of one another, as Geier and some others take it (*homo lupus homini*), but rather "in their own estimation" (see Metrical Version), as they are, or as they must appear, to themselves, in the light of their own general conduct,—the *speaking* of their own lives. This view at once clears Koheleth himself from Knobel's charge of materialism; though we see not how, in any other way, it can be denied. It is so far from materialism that, to the devout reader, it immediately raises the opposite thought. What Koheleth "*says in his heart*," throughout this passage, is a mournful rebuke (we will not call it by the heartless name of satire) of the worldly, sensual, beastlike life of man; whilst, by this very aspect of it he points to a higher destiny which the animal life of mere sense so directly contradicts: "Who knows it," who thinks of it (see the next marginal note)? and yet the bare thought of such a super-solar destiny, though carrying with it no knowledge of condition, lifts man above the earth and the beasts who descend wholly into it. There is, also, an evident paronomasia, here, of המה להם with the two words שהם בהמה, just preceding; and this also furnishes some reason for the peculiar style of expression, making it all the more forcible to the Hebrew ears addressed.

Thus also must we render ver. 22, by giving ראיתי the sense of *judgment* (as in many other places) instead of *sight* as a fact. It is the same hypothetical judgment, founded on human action, or what one must conclude as to "the supposed good," and the human destiny, if determined from such a standpoint of human conduct.—T. L.]

*[Ver. 21. מִי יוֹדֵעַ, "*who knows*," *etc.* ZÖCKLER disposes of this important passage too easily. From the Hebrew text as it stands there can be made no other translation than that given in our English Version. The ה in הָעֹלָה and in הַיֹּרֶדֶת [*that goeth up, that goeth down*] is the article. This cannot be overthrown, as STUART and others attempted to do, by examples of ה interrogative having patach with dagesh, every one of which, if not wholly anomalous, depends on peculiar conditions that do not here exist. The old Jewish

Digitized by Google

A return to the maxim already given in ver. 12, that one must cheerfully and joyously seize the present as now offered by God, and use it to get a sure path into the future.—**Than that a man should rejoice in his works**—בְּמַעֲשָׂיו, *i. e.*, in his labor and efforts in general, in his works as well as in their fruits; comp. v. 18. This "rejoicing in his own works," is not materially different from the passage in chap. ii. 24, that he should make his soul enjoy good in his labor [Hitzig thinks otherwise], nor from the expression (ver. 12, 13) "to rejoice and do good," *etc.*—**For that is his portion**—*i. e.*, for nothing farther is allotted to him here below, comp. ii. 10.—**For who shall bring him to see what shall be after him?**—That is, not into the condition after death, into the relations of human life in another world, but, as shown by the parallel passages, ch. vi. 12; ii. 19: into the future conditions of human life, into the relations as they shall be on earth after his departure from life (especially in his immediate surroundings and sphere of activity, comp. ii. 19). This sentence involves, therefore, neither a denial of the personal continuance of man (Hitzig), nor an authorization of the Epicurean principle: "Enjoy before death, that you may not go out empty" (Knobel), nor, indeed, any reference to the world beyond, but simply an exhortation to profit by the present in cheerful and diligent occupation, without being anxious and doubting about the future, which is indeed inaccessible to our human knowledge. Hengstenberg justly observes: "Man knows not what God will do," ver. 11. Therefore, it is foolish to chase after happiness by toilsome exertion, or to be full of anxiety and grief, ver. 9, 10; and quite as foolish (chap. vi. 12) to engage in many wide reaching schemings, to chase after the ἀδηλότητα πλούτου (1 Tim. vi. 17) to gather and heap for him to whom God will give it, ii. 26; but, on the contrary, it is rational to enjoy the present. Properly understood, therefore, this verse draws its practical consequence not from the verses 19-21 immediately preceding, but from the contents of the entire chapter.

APPENDIX TO THE EXEGETICAL.

[Interpretation of Verses 11, 14, 15: the Inquisition of the Ages, ver. 15, וְהָאֱלֹהִים יְבַקֵּשׁ אֶת נִרְדָּף. This remarkable language is rendered, in our English Version, "God requireth that which is past," or, as given in the

---

grammarians, who have never been surpassed in their thorough knowledge of these minutiæ of their language, have reduced the matter to rules by an exhaustive induction that leaves no doubt. One of these rules is, that every ה קמוצה or *he kamezatus*, to use their technics [or ה with ָ] before ע, is every where the article of specification [ה ידיעה], never the interrogative. It might have been so said in respect to the gutturals generally, with a very few exceptions having their peculiar reasons not here found. But in the case of ע there are no exceptions. This settles the question for the word הָעֹלָה even if it had stood alone. But there is the participle הַיֹּרֶדֶת presenting a still stronger case for the article. Here ה cannot be interrogative. The attempt to make it so would only interfere with another rule which is settled without exception, namely, that ה interrogative may cause dagesh in a radical following if it has *scheva* [שוויה], but never without it, so that the ה in הַיֹּרֶדֶת [the radical י having its vowel cholem] must be the pronominal article *(that which* goeth down). This is confirmed by Aben-Ezra, Rabbi Schelomo, Ben Melech, Kimchi, and others. In fact, the best Jewish authorities are here all one way. But then, it is gratuitously said, the authors of the Masora changed the punctuation. There is neither reason nor authority for such an assertion. The LXX. indeed has *ει αναβαινει (if it ascends)*, but this Version was made from unpointed Hebrew, and, on such a question, settles nothing against the better understanding of the Masorites. The Vulgate follows the LXX. [*si ascendat*], and the Syriac has every appearance of having been here conformed to the Greek, as in many other places. Besides the LXX. and Vulgate rendering would not correspond to the ה interrogative, but rather to the particle אִם (if), which would be the best word in Hebrew if such a doubt were to be expressed: מִי יוֹדֵעַ הָרוּחַ אִם עֹלָה הִיא וְאִם יֹרֶדֶת.

If we look at the internal evidence, the case for the article will be found still stronger. Taking the passage as Stuart does and Hitzig; or as it is somewhat qualified by Zöckler, we find ourselves involved in terrible difficulties. We cannot rest with ascribing to Koheleth merely ignorance, or non-recognition, of the doctrine of the soul's survival. That might, with some reason, be said of an Old Testament writer generally, namely, that he says nothing about it, and seems to have no knowledge of it. This is not, however, the case with Koheleth. He had doubtless heard an echo of the old belief, held, beyond all doubt, by nations cotemporary, and so curtly expressed in the Grecian Drama, as something that had come down from ancient days:—

πνεῦμα μὲν πρὸς αἰθέρα,
τὸ σῶμα δ εἰς γῆν.

He shows his knowledge of the dogma, as a belief existing, and then denies its truth, or attempts to throw doubt upon it. This is certainly strange, unexampled, we may say, in the Old Testament. Worse than all, he not only denies it, but scoffingly denies it, as though it were an absurd thought, should it even chance to occur to one of these poor creatures whose vain condition he is so graphically describing—a foolish hope, itself a *vanitas vanitatum*. He sneers at it as something which might be vainly held by a few—some early *Essene dreamers* perhaps—but was wholly contrary to sense and experience. No one knows any thing about it. It would be something like the sneer that used to be heard from the coarser kind of infidels—who ever *saw* a soul? This cannot be the serious Kohéleth, the man, too, who so expressly, so solemnly says, xii. 7, "that the spirit does go up to God who gave it."

How then shall we take the question מִי יוֹדֵעַ? There is but one way, and that seems conclusive of the view presented in the note page 71. It does not express the disbelief or even doubt of Kohéleth, but is, in fact, his reproof of men in general, as he sees them living and acting in his day. Their lives are a denial of any essential difference between man and the brute. Who among them knows—who recognizes—this great difference? Moreover, the expression מִי יוֹדֵעַ must be taken as an universal or a partial negation, according to the ideas that necessarily enter into the context; as in chap ii. 19, it is equivalent to *no one knows*. So in Ps. xc. 11, "who knoweth the power of thine anger,"—a thing most real, yet hard to be appreciated. Compare also Joel ii. 14; Jon. iii. 9, מִי־יוֹדֵעַ יָשׁוּב וְנִחַם where it expresses a hope, "who knows but he may turn and repent." In Isaiah liii. 1, a precisely similar expression, "who hath believed our report," denotes what is most rare. So in Ps. xciv. 16, "who will rise up for me against the enemy?" Again, "who hath known the mind of the Lord," Rom. xi. 34 (τίς γαρ ἔγνω, *cognovit recognovit*). This, says S. Basil, *significat non quod absurdum est, sed quod rarum*. So here: How few, if any, *recognise* the great truth, the great difference between man and beast? The context, the general aspect of the passage, together with what the writer most seriously affirms in other places, must all be considered; and it would show, we think, that in uttering this complaining query, he was only the more strongly expressing his individual opinion, or feeling rather, of the mighty, yet unheeded difference. There must surely be for man something better than all this dying vanity, if he would only recognise it. That ידע may have this sense, is shown by the use of the verb in many places, and especially by the infinitive noun דעת, which often means *belief, opinion, tenet, etc.* Zöckler's reference to John i. 18: "No man hath seen God at any time," we cannot help regarding as containing a fallacy of interpretation, and as being, in reference to this passage, quite irrelevant.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

margin, "that which is driven away."—Zöckler has *das Verdrängte*, that which is pushed away, crowded out. None of these give the exact force of נִרְדָּף, nor do they seem to recognize the very peculiar figure which is so strongly suggested by נִרְדָּף and יְבַקֵּשׁ when thus taken together. *Pursued*, the true rendering, is something different from being *driven away*, or *crowded out*. The expression does, undoubtedly, refer to time past, but not after the common representation of something left behind us, but rather of something sent before, or gone before, which is chased and shall be overtaken. It is more like an idea very frequent in the Koran, and coming undoubtedly from the ancient Arabic theology, that the lives of men, and especially their sins, are all gone before to meet them at the judgment. The *flight of time* is a common figure in all languages, and especially its great swiftness—*sed fugit interea fugit irreparabile tempus*. The representation of the ages driving away their predecessors, and taking their places, is also a familiar one, as in *Ovid Met.* XV. 181:

ut unda impellitur unda,
Urgeturque prior venienti, urgetque priorem,
Tempora sic fugiunt pariter pariterque sequuntur.

The figure here, however, although presenting this general image, has something else that is both rare and striking. We know it from the words נִרְדָּף and יְבַקֵּשׁ which, as thus used, immediately call up the idea of the flying homicide with the avenger or the inquisitor [מְבַקֵּשׁ] behind him. See how רדף is used in such passages as Deut. xix. 6; Josh. xx. 5 [יִרְדֹּף גֹּאֵל הַדָּם אַחֲרֵי הָרֹצֵחַ וגו׳], and בִּקֵּשׁ, denoting inquisitor (pursuer or avenger), in places like 2 Sam. iv. 11 [אֲבַקֵּשׁ אֶת דָּמוֹ], Ezek. iii. 18, 20; xxxiii. 8, and, without דם [blood], 1 Sam. xx. 16, besides other places where this old law of pursuit is referred to. They all show that the words [and especially בִּקֵּשׁ] had acquired a judicial, a forensic, or technical sense. The figure here, however strange it may seem, can hardly be mistaken: God will make inquisition for that which is pursued, that which has gone before us, seemingly fled away, as though it had escaped forever. They are not gone, these past ages of wrong; they shall be called up again. They shall be overtaken and made "to stand up in their lot," at some "latter day" of judgment and inquisition. There can be no severance of times from each other; מַה שֶּׁהָיָה כְּבָר הוּא:

What was is present now;
The future has already been;
And God demands again the ages fled.

The thought is closely allied to the cyclical idea so prominent elsewhere in this book (see i. 9, 10; vi. 10), and the idea of the olam as the unity of the cosmos in time. As each power or thing in space, according to an old thought existing long before Newton, is present dynamically and statically in every other part of space, so is every time present in every other time, and in the whole of olamic duration. The cosmos is one in both respects. It is the עולם of God "to which nothing can be added (ver. 14) and from which nothing can be diminished." But besides this cyclical idea, which would seem like asserting an actual reappearance, it may be said, with equal emphasis, that the ages come again in judgment, and as really, too, in one sense, as when they were here, in the events to be judged. God shall arraign these homicidal centuries; "He shall call to them and they shall stand up, and say here we are" (Isa. xlviii. 13; Job xxxviii. 35). It is the same great idea of judgment that seems to pervade all the writer says, and which comes out so clearly, and so solemnly, at the close: "For God will bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." It is that great thought which has ever been in the souls of men, and which they cannot get rid of. It appears in the Old Testament, Ps. i. 5 [לֹא יָקֻמוּ רְשָׁעִים בַּמִּשְׁפָּט, "the wicked shall not stand in the judgment];" Daniel xii.; Eccles. xii. 14; Job xxi. 30 [כִּי לְיוֹם אֵיד יֵחָשֶׂךְ רָע]; Proverbs and Prophets sparsim. How prominent the idea, though indefinite as to time and manner, in the Greek dramatic poetry: there must be retribution for wrong, however it may take place, and however long delayed,—retribution open, penal, positive, and not merely as concealed in blind physical consequences. It presents itself more or less in all mythologies; but its deepest seat is in the human conscience. If there is any thing that may be called a tenet of natural religion, it is this, that there *will* be, that there *must* be, a righting of all wrongs, and a way and a time for its manifestation. It holds its place amid all speculative difficulties; it rises over all objections that any philosophy, or any science, can bring against it in respect to time, place, or manner; it remains in the face of all doubts and questions arising out of any doctrine of eschatology, so called. Deeper than any speculative reasoning lies in the soul the feeling that tells us *it must be so*. We cannot bear the thought that the world's drama shall go on forever without any closing act, without any *συντέλεια*, reckoning, or winding up, whether final, or preparatory to some higher era. We cannot read a poor work of fiction, even, without feeling pain if it does not *end well*,—if right is not made clear, and wrong punished, even according to our poor fallen standard of right and wrong. The worst man has more or less of this feeling. We have all reason to fear the judgment; but when the mind is in something of a proper state, or when reason and conscience are predominant, the soul would rather suffer the pain arising from the risk and fear of the individual condemnation, than obtain deliverance from it by the loss of the glorious idea.

This doctrine of judgment is not only in harmony with that cyclical idea which is strongly suggested by the general aspect of the passage, and especially by what immediately precedes in this same verse, but may be regarded, in some respects, as identical with it. If any choose so

Digitized by Google

to view it, the ages past may be said to be judged in the ages that follow, though still in connection with the thought of some general and final manifestation. Such is the view which is most impressively given by Rabbi SCHELOMO in his comments on the passage. He deduces from it a notion similar to one that is now a favorite with some of our modern authorities. It is, that history repeats itself; the events in one age being types of succeeding events on a larger scale in another. The Jewish writer has the same thought, though he gives it more of a retributive aspect, as though these types came over again in judgment. As we should expect, too, he draws his examples from the Scriptural history, or from traditions connected with it. Thus Esau pursues Jacob. It is the same thing coming over, on a larger scale, when Egypt pursues the children of Israel. Other examples are given from other parts of the Jewish history, and then he says, generally: "that which is going to be in the latter day is the exemplar [דוגמה, it should be דיגמה, a Rabbinical word formed from the Greek δεῖγμα, παράδειγμα] of what already has been; as in the first, so it is in the last" [באחרונה כאשר בראשונה]. He means that the first event is the δεῖγμα, the παράδειγμα, or paradigm, to which the latter is adapted, either retributively, or for some other purpose, and taken, generally, on a larger scale.

The commentary of ABEN EZRA on the passage is also well worthy of note. His general remark on the whole verse is that God's way is one—that is, that the world, whether regarded in space or time, has a perfect unity of idea, מעשה אלהים על דרך אחת, and then he thus proceeds to explain the verse: "What was (or is), already had there been like it, and that which is to be, of old there had been the same; and that which is pursued (נִרְדָּף), or the past, is that which is present, and that (the present) lies between the past and the future. The meaning of it is that God seeks from time that it shall be pursued, time pursuing after time, and never fail; for the time that is past again becomes the present [העומד that which stands], and the time that is to be, shall be again like that which was, and so it is all *one time*. If we divide time into the future and the past, then, in the course of things (גלגל the wheel, or mundane orbit), it becomes clear that every portion ever *pursues* after one point (or towards one point), and that is the centre, so that the portion that was in the East appears again in the West, and conversely; and to the place of the world's revolution there is no beginning from which such motion commences; for every beginning is an end, and every end a beginning, and that *which is pursued*, that is the centre, and so it is clear to us that all the work of God is on one way,"—or, as we would say, on one idea, ever repeating itself. See something like this in the Book of Problems, ascribed to ARISTOTLE, Vol. XIV., Leip.; Prob. XVIII., Sec. 8, on the question, "How shall we take the terms Before and After?" (on the supposition of an eternal repeating cycle).

It is the idea in ver. 14 which seems mainly to have influenced ABEN EZRA, and other Jewish commentators [such as LEVI BEN GERSON, in his profound book entitled *Milchamoth ha-Schem*], in the interpretation of these words of the 15th: "I learned that all which God made is for eternity [or the world time, לעולם]; to it there is no adding, and from it there is no diminishing, and God made it that men might fear before him." This, in their view, would seem to refer not merely to the amount of matter in the cosmos, or the amount of force, or motion, or even to the amount of space and time assigned to it, but to the amount of eventualities making up the olam,—or, as we might rather say, the amount of historical action, as one great drama, having a perfect unity, both of movement and idea, so that any change would be a diminution or an addition, out of harmony with the one great spiritual thought to whose manifestation it is devoted. This is shown, "that men might fear before him," מלפניו, in the presence of such a God; as though there was something more awful in such an exhibition of the eternal *thought*, than in any display of mere *power*, whether in the natural or the supernatural. See remarks on the Divine constancy in the greater movements of Nature, and the quotation from CICERO in Note on the Olamic Words, p. 51.

Some modern writers who dogmatize about the supernatural, and deny its possibility, might, perhaps, regard the philosophizing author of Koheleth, especially when thus interpreted by these Jewish doctors, as being of the same opinion. Thus, in ver. 14, he would seem to say, that there is no change out of a fixed law and fixed idea of the universe, whatever may have been his conception of the world's extent. There is no addition, no diminution, and this would seem to exclude every thing that was not provided for in the original arrangement of forces, and in the system of causation which it embraces, with all its machinery, great and small. Now we may say that these venerable Rabbis, although sincere and devout believers in the supernatural, understood the nature of this argument as well as any of its modern, English, French and German propounders. No where has it ever been more profoundly discussed than by LEVI BEN GERSON in the Sixth book of the work before referred to, where he treats of Miracles and Prophecy,—although written nearly six hundred years ago. If by the supernatural is meant any departure from the *system of things* which God arranged from the beginning, or any change in the great series of causes and effects, antecedents and consequents, which constitute the *sum of things*, including the Divine will, thought, and action, among them,—then is there no supernatural. But this would be reducing the whole great question to a trifling play upon words. If, however, by the words supernatural, or miraculous—though they do not mean exactly the same thing—there be intended the changes which God Himself may introduce into the visible nature, "according to the counsel of His own will," but which are physically connected with no prior working of cosmical dynamical agencies, then *there is* a supernatural, although this supernatural belongs as much to the *one* great idea, or system of things, as the most seemingly regular

causation, or most familiar sequence of antecedents and consequents ever presented to our senses. Far more than this—it is not merely a part of that one great idea, but truly constitutive of it, as its very essence. The supernatural, as differing from the merely miraculous, is something eternal, lying above nature, upholding nature in its origin, regulating its creative days, sending into it new creative words to raise it to higher and still higher planes, deflecting, if need be, its general course, and, at times, interrupting its movements, thus producing what we call miracles, prodigies, signs, *etc.* These, however, in distinction from originating or creating acts, must be regarded as belonging to a world, or to a department of the world, where evil, or moral irregularity, predominates. We may feel warranted in saying, that in a state sinless in the beginning, if God had so willed to secure it, or which had continued sinless, if God had so willed to keep it, or in one which had reached a sinless condition, and where the moral order was unbroken, there would be no miracles, so called, no interruptions in the constant harmonious series of things and events. There would be no need of them; for nature itself would be religious, ever manifesting instead of hiding God. In such constancy of movement there would be, for holy souls, no dimming of the Divine glory, no deifying of second causes, no veiling of a personal Deity under the sheltering name of natural law. There would be sublimity, admiration, exalted contemplation, reverence never lowered, adoring study never tiring, wonder never diminished by familiarity,—all *miranda*, yet no *miracula*, as we now use the term, no prodigies, portents, σημεῖα, τέρατα, arresting signs, startling displays of power, such as may be demanded in the regulation of that lower sphere where moral and spiritual disorder have their mirrored counterpart in a dark and refracted nature. In such a fallen world, however, miracles, signs, *etc.*, may be parts of the Divine plan, having their proper place, and to be brought in at such intervals of time, with such intermissions, and in such ways, as the eternal wisdom may decide. They are all in the great idea, together with all such means, if need be, for their bringing out in time. If not *regular*, in the sense of calculable recurrence, they are all *regulated.* They belong to the עֹלָם, the world, or whole (ver. 14), which cannot be added to nor diminished. "God hath done it that men may fear before him." To a fallen race there is ground for fear both ways. There is something awful for them, both in the constant and in the portentous. To such a moral state there is something terrible in this fixedness of nature; it so shows us our impotence, our dependence, notwithstanding all our boasts of what our reason, or our science, are going to achieve; it gives us such just reason to fear, if we have no higher faith to allay it, lest we may perchance be crushed in some unknown and unknowable turning of its mighty wheels,—and this, too, notwithstanding the petty victories which we now and then seem to obtain over it, but which may be only a deflecting of its resistless movement into some more destructive channel. On the other hand, there is the dread of the portentous, the "coming out from his (hiding) place" of the spiritual power that men would so gladly forget, or veil from themselves under the deification of nature and natural law.

It is thus that Rabbi SCHELOMO interprets the language as referring to the fear of the portentous: "The Blessed One, in the beginning of His work, had purposed how the world should be, and no change can take place in it either by way of increase or diminution. When it is changed (or appears to be changed) it is God that does it. He commands and effects the change, that *men should fear before him.*" That is, the belief in the supernatural, or in some higher power and will that can, and does, change the visible course of nature as presented to our sense and our experience, is, for us, the ground of all religion—that is, of all "*fear of the Lord*"—the term יראת יהוה being the Hebrew name for religion in its essential definition, as דרך יהוה (*the way of the Lord*) denotes its practical action. And then he proceeds: "Thus it was that Oceanus broke its bound in the generation of Enosh, and inundated one-third of the world; and this God did that men might fear before Him. Again, for seven days the course of the sun was changed in the generation of the flood, and this was that men might fear before Him." After these semi-scriptural, semi-traditional instances, he mentions the turning back of the ten degrees in the days of Hezekiah. "All this was done that men might fear before Him." And then he concludes, as the Jewish writers generally do, "that it is not good for man to engage in useless physical disputation (לעסוק), or to study any thing but the commands and ways of God, and thus to fear before Him." See Job xxviii. 21-28.

In rendering the 15th verse, the Vulgate presents the idea of cyclical renovation: *quod factum est ipsum permanet; quæ futura sint jam fuerunt, et Deus instaurat quod abit*—"God renews what is past." The LXX. seems to have in view the idea of retribution in its very literal rendering, ὁ Θεὸς ζητήσει τὸν διωκόμενον, where there would appear to be an allusion to the fleeing homicide. The Syriac: "That which was before is now, and all that is to be has been, and God seeks for the pursued that is pursued." The tautology arose, perhaps, from some dim perception of the idea, but in the attempt to make it clear, the Syriac has only made it the more obscure.

It would seem to have been an old Rabbinical fancy to represent one world, or עולם, thus following another, or one cycle of events making way for another, by the birth of Jacob with his hand upon Esau's heel. We have this imagery of the idea in a strange passage from the Apocryphal book of 2 Esdras chap. vi. 7: "Then answered I and said, what shall be the parting asunder of the times; or when shall be the end of the first and the beginning of it that followeth? And he (the angel) said unto me, from Abraham unto Isaac, when Jacob and Esau were born of him, Jacob's hand held fast the heel of Esau; for Esau is the end of the world [the עולם αἰών] and Jacob is the beginning of it that followeth. The hand of man is betwixt the

heel and the hand. Other question, Esdras, ask thou not." The book is apocryphal, but it shows the reasoning of its day, and how some of the old language was understood.—T. L.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

(*With Homiletical Hints.*)

The two halves of this section, of which the one (vers. 1-11) presents the reason for the temporal restriction of earthly happiness, and the other (vers. 12-22) the nature of this earthly and temporal happiness, are to each other as the *theoretical and practical* part of a connected series of reflections on the theme of the temporal nature of all human efforts and deeds. The clause, that "to every thing there is a season," or the theoretical principal part of the reflection, is subservient to the clause, "rejoice and do good in thy life," as a foundation sustaining the practical. The illustrations of the immutability of the eternal decrees of God (vers. 14, 15), of the ever just distribution of human destinies in the next world (vers. 16, 17), and of the total uncertainty of the fate of the spirit of man after death (vers. 18-21), are but subsequent glances from the practical to the theoretical portion, whereby is specially shown, in various ways, the necessity of a joyous and diligent use of the present, in order thus to lend more emphasis to the final exhortation to rejoice in the works of this life. The entire contents of the chapter are therefore, substantially, of an exhortatory character, a reference to the eternal rule of the Highest, that insures to the man, who walks in His paths, happiness in the next world, if not in this, and thus encourages him to grateful and cheerful enjoyment of present blessings, and to unalloyed confidence in the benevolent and assisting hand of God. The theme of KOHELETH's present section, according to the just observation of HENGSTENBERG, is mainly in unison with the expression of Jeremiah (x. 23): "I know, O Lord, that the way of man is not in himself; it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps," or, with the ground thought of the hymn of consolation in affliction,

> I know, my God, that all mine acts,
> And doings rest upon thy will,—

or of the verses,

> Why, then, should I repine,
> And on the future think?

or this,

> On Heaven's blessing, and its grace,
> Is all my care reposed,

and others similar. Only in this text there is no necessity of referring the consoling tendency of the section specially to the people of Israel as an *Ecclesia pressa*, suffering amid stern persecutions and ill treatment on the part of external enemies. For if the chapter presents also some allusions to sufferings and wrongs as prevalent occurrences in the epoch and surroundings of the author, (vers. 16-18, and comp. also for the impossibility of the origin of these descriptions from the Solomon of history: *Int.* p. 13) nothing at all can be discovered in illustration of these sad events, from the stand-point of the theocratic and redemptive pragmatism of the prophets. The descriptions in question maintain, rather, a very general character, and nowhere reflect on the individual position, or the redemptive calling of the people of Israel. For which reason, also, these must be condemned as forced and artificial, that allegorical conception of the introductory verses 1-8, by virtue of which HENGSTENBERG and some predecessors would discover here special allusions to the changing destinies of the people of God, and explain "to be born," and "to die," in the sense of Isa. liv. 1; Hab. i. 12; and "to plant," and "to pluck up," in the sense of Ps. lxxx. 8, 12; "to kill," and "to heal," in the sense of Hos. vi. 1; "to break down" and "build up," in the sense of Jeremiah xxiv. 6; xxxi. 6; xlii. 10. In the practical treatment of this section, this specific redemptory reference, together with others, may certainly have its due influence, but it can lay no claim to exclusive attention.

In the practical and homiletical treatment of this chapter, we are to give special care to the consideration of the very characteristic assertions regarding the world that is set in the hearts of men, (ver. 11.), and the equality of the final destiny of men and beasts in death (vers. 18-21). On the basis of the former passage we should develop the elements of the doctrine of the knowledge of God, to be derived from nature, and the eternal nature and calling of man, (comp. FABRI, "*Time and Eternity*," already quoted, especially pp. 60 ff.). In connection with the second part, on the contrary, we demonstrate that double character of human nature, belonging in the body to time, but in the Spirit to God and eternity, and point out the practical consequences resulting therefrom for the feelings and the conduct of the children of God. In addition to the homiletical hints quoted below from TAULER, MELANCHTHON, *etc.*, comp. especially KLEINERT, on the Old Testament doctrine of the Spirit of God (*Annual for German Theology*, 1867, No. 1, p. 18): The enlivening and elevating truth, that our flesh lives through the Spirit of God (Gen. ii. 7), becomes in KOHELETH a two-edged sword, that turns against its own rejoicing; since all life is from God, that of man as of beast, (iii. 19, 20); our life is that of something foreign to us, and belongs not to us (comp. viii. 8), but must again give up its substance at another's behest, to become what it was—dust, (iii. 20; xii. 7).

To treat the unity of thought in a comprehensive and homiletical style, one might most fittingly take up vers. 11 and 12, and make a formula of them, something in the following manner: "*As a citizen of the world, and an heir of eternity, man should thankfully enjoy the pleasures of this life, and by a conscientious performance of its duties gather fruits propitious for eternity.*" Or, "*Live nobly in time, and eternity will crown thee.*" Or, "Seek in time to live thy eternal life; then will it, in the future, certainly be thine." Comp. also these lines of BÖHME:

> From conflict ever freed is he,
> To whom the eternal is as time,
> And time is as eternity.

HOMILETICAL HINTS ON SEPARATE PASSAGES.

Ver. 1. BRENZ: Solomon condemns in the beginning of this chapter all anxious reflection

Digitized by Google

and care concerning earthly things, above all, useless worldly anxiety. For this is so deeply rooted in the minds of many, indeed of most men, that it can scarcely be eradicated. This is a torment not only of a very painful, but of an entirely useless character. Nearly all other trials and troubles can be easily borne, and oppress only the body; but anxiety ruins both body and soul.—Therefore Solomon here says: Act ever so justly or unjustly, and torture thyself with care till death, thou wilt travail in vain before the completion of the time fixed by God. For, everything occurs according to His divine arrangement, in His own time, without our intervention.

LUTHER: That nothing occurs before the hour arrives which has been determined by God, Solomon proves by examples drawn from all human affairs, and says: There is a time to build up and a time to break down, *etc.*, and concludes therefrom that all human resolve in thought, reverie, or effort, is simply a phantom, a shadow, an illusion, unless it be first resolved in heaven. Kings, princes, lords, may hold their councils and resolve what they will; the thing whose hour has come, will occur; the others stand still and hinder and impede each other. And although it may seem that the hour is now come, nothing will take place till the hour does come, although all men on earth should tear themselves to pieces. God permits neither kings, princes, lords, nor wise men on earth to set the dial for Him. He will set it; and we are not to tell Him what it has struck. He will tell us. Christ says in the gospel: My hour is not yet come, *etc.*—HAMANN: We find here a series of contradictory things and actions which occur in human life, but which cannot possibly exist together, and hence each has its special time. That moment is fixed for everything which is the best and the most fitting for it. The beauty of things consists in this moment of their maturity which God awaits. He who would eat the blossom of the cherry to taste the fruit, would form a faulty judgment regarding it; he who would judge of the cool shade of the trees from the temperature of winter, and their form in this season, would judge blindly. And we make just such conclusions regarding God's government and its purpose!

Vers. 2-8. GEIER (ver. 2): Plants and trees are set and tended on account of their fruits, and the unfruitful are rooted up. Art thou then, O man, planted in the garden of the Lord, but unfruitful, beware, and reform, else wilt thou also be rooted up? Luke xiii. 6ff.

STARKE (ver. 3, 1st clause): God is so gracious that He wounds and lacerates the hearts of men for their own good, but heals them again by the assurance of His grace, and the pardon of sins, Hos. vi. 1.

HENGSTENBERG (ver. 3, second clause): The people of God have the advantage therein that the *destructive* activity is ever a means and a preparation for the *constructive*, and that the final purpose of God is ever directed to the latter. Therefore one can be cheerful and consoled in the kingdom of God, during the momentary activity of destruction.—(Ver. 8): The epoch in which this book was written, was mainly a "period of hatred," as the faithful learned it by daily and painful experience. But they were assured by the word of God that, in some future time, a "period of love would come, such as they had not seen" (Isa. xlix. 28; lx. 16; lxvi. 12), and while hoping for this it was more easy for them to accept the seeming hatred from the same dear hand that would dispense the love. . . . . The whole finds its end in the sweet name of peace, which is so engraven on the heart of the church militant. Peace, peace, to him that is far off, and to him that is near, saith the Lord, Isa. lvii. 19.

Vers. 9, 10. LUTHER: Before the hour comes, thought and labor are lost. But we are, nevertheless, to labor, each in his sphere and with diligence. God commands this; if we hit the hour, things prosper; if we do not, nothing comes of it, and thus no human thought avails. They, therefore, who would anticipate God's hour, struggle, and have nothing but care and sorrow.

STARKE (ver. 10): Sin causes man to have many cares, dangers, and vexations in the employments of life, Gen. iii. 17. It is not the active but the permissive will of God, that permits sinful men to experience these various evil results of their sins.

Ver. 11. BRENZ:—Although God has created all things in the best and wisest way, and fitted them to our needs, our own will, and our shortsighted earthly wisdom nevertheless prevent us from deriving the profit and enjoyment therefrom which the beasts find in the works of God.

GEIER:—In searching out the works and ways of God be careful not curiously to seek things hidden of God, and on the contrary to neglect His revealed will to the injury of our souls.

STARKE:—The indwelling desire of the human soul to live eternally is a remnant of the divine image. O that we would endeavor to calm this feeling in the right manner, how happy then would we be!

ELSTER:—The ability of man to reflect in himself the harmony of the world (? more correctly, the eternal power and divinity of the Most High mirrored in the things of the world) is indeed a power in whose perfect exercise the individual is impeded by individual weakness. Because the original, pure harmony of the spirit, is obscured in the inner man, he cannot comprehend that which exists without him in its full purity and truth; and that which is highest he is only able to comprehend imperfectly, namely, the eternal, divine, creative thoughts which form the innermost essence of things.

Vers. 12-15. MELANCHTHON (vers. 12, 13):—These words are not intended satirically to illustrate the principles of a man of Epicurean enjoyment, but to express the seriously meant doctrine that the things of this world are to be used and enjoyed according to divine intent and command, and also to impart directions for the happy and temperate enjoyment of them. We must, therefore, look in faith to God, perform the works of our calling, implore and await God's help and blessing, bear patiently the toils and burdens that He sends, and then certainly know that, so far as our labor is crowned with success, this comes from the guidance and protection of God.

LUTHER:—Because so many obstacles and

Digitized by Google

misfortunes meet those who are diligent and mean to be faithful and upright, and because there is so much unhappiness in the world, there is nothing better than cheerfully to employ the present that God gives to our hand, and not to worry and grieve with cares and thoughts about the future. But the skill lies in being able to do it; that is the gift of God.

OSIANDER, (vers. 14, 15): God acts immutably that we may therein perceive His majesty and power, fear Him, and serve Him with piety and highest reverence. However God deals with us, we must accept it, and consider it good, Job ii.10.

BERLEBURG BIBLE:—You must not hesitate and let yourself for that reason (by sorrows and tribulations) be drawn away from the highest good. For God will not let the injustice and violence that are done to the pious, go unpunished.

Vers. 16, 17. HANSEN:—As there is here a certain period when men follow their inclinations, so there is, beyond, a fixed time when they will be summoned before a tribunal.

HENGSTENBERG:—The sentence on the wicked may be expected with so much the more confidence, when they have assumed the place of judgment and justice, and from thence practised their iniquity, thus abusing magisterial power.

Vers. 18-21. TAULER:—Man is composed from time and eternity; from time as regards the body, from eternity as regards the spirit. Now everything inclines towards its origin. Because the body is composed from earth and time, it inclines to temporal things, and finds its pleasure therein. Because the spirit came from God, and is composed from eternity, it inclines therefore to God and eternity. When man turns from time and creatures to eternity and God, he has an inworking in God and eternity, and thus makes eternity from time, and from the creature God in the godly man.

MELANCHTHON:—Solomon speaks thus of external appearances. If one questioned only the eyes and the judgment, without listening to the word of God, human life would appear to be governed by mere chance, to such an extent that men would seem to be, as it were, like a great ant-hill, and like ants to be crushed. But the revelation of the divine word must be placed in contrast with this appearance.

STARKE:—As thou desirest, after death, a better state than that of beasts, see to it, then, that in life thou dost distinguish thyself from the beasts by a reasonable, Christian demeanor, Ps. xxxii. 9.

Ver. 22. WOHLFARTH:—Only the moment that we live in life, is our possession. Every hour lived sinks irrevocably into the sea of the past: the future is uncertain: therefore is he a fool who lets the present slip by unused, wastes it in vain amusement, or grieves with useless lamentations.

HENGSTENBERG:—See the exegetical remarks on this passage.

B. The Impediments to Earthly Happiness, proceeding partly from personal misfortune of various kinds, and partly from the evils of social and civil life.

CHAP. IV. 1–16.

1. The personal misfortune of many men.

(VERS. 1–6.)

1 So I returned and considered all the oppressions that are done under the sun; and
behold the tears of *such as were* oppressed, and they had no comforter; and on the
2 side of their oppressors *there was* power; but they had no comforter. Wherefore I
praised the dead which are already dead more than the living which are yet alive.
3 Yea, better *is he* than both they, which had not yet been, who hath not seen the
4 evil work that is done under the sun. Again, I considered all travail, and every
right work, that for this a man is envied of his neighbor. This *is* also vanity
5 and vexation of spirit. The fool foldeth his hands together, and eateth his own
6 flesh. Better *is* an handful *with* quietness, than both the hands full *with* travail and
vexation of spirit.

2. The evils of social life.

(VERS. 7–12.)

7, 8 Then I returned and saw vanity under the sun. There is one *alone*, and *there*
is not a second; yea, he hath neither child nor brother: yet *is there* no end of all
his labour, neither is his eye satisfied with riches: neither *saith he*, For whom do I

Digitized by Google

labour, and bereave my soul of good? This *is* also vanity, yea, it *is* a sore travail.
9 Two *are* better than one; because they have a good reward for their labour
10 For if they fall, the one will lift up his fellow: but wo to him *that is* alone when
11 he falleth; for *he hath* not another to help him up. Again, if two lie together.
12 then they have heat: but how can one be warm *alone?* And if one prevail against
him, two shall withstand him; and a threefold cord is not quickly broken.

8. The evils of civil life.

(VERS. 13–16.)

13 Better *is* a poor and a wise child, than an old and foolish king, who will no more
14 be admonished. For out of prison he cometh to reign; whereas also *he that is* born
15 in his kingdom becometh poor. I considered all the living which walk under the
16 sun, with the second child that shall stand up in his stead. *There is* no end of all
the people, *even* of all that have been before them: they also that come after shall
not rejoice in him. Surely this also *is* vanity and vexation of spirit.

[Ver. 1. וְשַׁבְתִּי אֲנִי וָאֶרְאֶה: I turned and saw, or I returned and saw, I looked again—שַׁבְתִּי used adverb ally, to denote repetition.—T. L.]

Ver. 2. וְשַׁבֵּחַ אֲנִי the participle piel with מ omitted, מְשַׁבֵּחַ. The examples ZÖCKLER brings in support of its being the *infinitive*, do not bear him out. Comp. מַהֵר for מְמַהֵר *Zeph.* i. 14, in like manner the Pual participle without מ, as לֻקָּח 2 Kings ii. 10, for מְלֻקָּח, יוּלָּד for מְיֻלָּד Jud. xiii. 8, and יוּקָשִׁים Eccles. ix. 12, for מְיוּקָשִׁים.

[Ver. 5. כִּשְׁרוֹן. See remarks, p. 53.—T. L.]

[Ver. 8. וּלְמִי: "and for whom." The apparent conjunction ו, here, seems rather to have the force of an interjection, as in וְאֵיךְ ii. 16 (see remarks on it, p. 58). *Alas! how is it;* so here, *Ah me! for whom.* Our conjunction has sometimes a similar emphatic instead of a mere copulative force. Or, it may be doubted whether, in such cases, instead of being copulative at all, it is any thing more than the exclamation وَا in Arabic, which is, in like manner, joined to other words, as *waika*, *vae tibi*, or *wa laka*, *eheu tibi*, and sometimes to exclamatory phrases, as *wa-sawa ta hu*, in one word, *proh dolor*, O what a calamity! The abrupt exclamation is much more impressive and significant than the filling up of our English Version, "neither does he say." This is, moreover, false, since the writer does mean to represent the solitary rich man as thus saying. It is pressed out of him by a sudden sense of his folly. DR. VAN DYKE, in his late Arabic translation, makes it thus abruptly follow, which is the more easily done, since his Arabic word so nearly resembles the Hebrew, whilst the conjunction فَ instead of وَ gives it more of subjective connection. In such cases as this the Hebrew particle was doubtless pronounced *wu*, instead of the mere vowel sound *u*. In like manner, *wa* is *ua*, or *oua*, like the French *oui*. Compare Greek οὐά, Mark xv. 29 (also found in classical Greek), and the more frequent οὐαί; also the Hebrew אוֹי, וֹי, *woi*, or *ou-oi*. Even as a conjunction it has an emotional power: "*and O, for whom, etc*"—T. L.]

[Ver. 14. הָסוּרִים evidently a contraction for הָאֲסוּרִים. It is written according to the sound,—the אֲ with its light *shewa*, becoming a quiescent and disappearing, as in אֲשֶׁר when it becomes שֶׁ. This writing words according to the sound may mark an earlier period, when some changes had taken place, but attention had not been much drawn to the radical orthography as in later times. It is, however, very unsafe to draw any inference from it as to dates, either way. In Jeremiah xxxvii. 15, we have בֵּית הָאֵסוּר, the singular of the word written in full, and used as synonymous with בֵּית הַכֶּלֶא, house of restraint.—T. L.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The plan of this section is extremely simple and clear. Each of the three divisions or strophes, as given above, is again divided into two smaller parts or half strophes, with which, each time, new turns of thought commence. The complete scheme is as follows: *First strophe:* The *personal* misfortune of men: vers. 1-6; first half strophe: vers. 1-3; second half strophe: vers. 4-6. *Second strophe:* The evils of social life: vers. 7-12; first half strophe: vers. 7, 8; second half strophe: vers. 9-12. *Third strophe:* The evils of civil life: vers. 18-16; first half strophe: vers. 18, 14; second half strophe: vers. 15, 16.—Comp. VAIHINGER, *Comment.*, p. 32 f., and also the DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL portion of this section.

2. *First strophe:* vers. 1-6. It is not the really unfortunate men that alone suffer sorrows, oppressions, and violence of the most various nature (vers. 1-3); the fortunate also find the joy of their life embittered by envy and want of true repose of soul (vers. 4-6).—**So I returned**—namely, from the previous course of my reflections (which, according to chap. 3, had dwelt upon the foundation and nature of the earthly happiness of men). HENGSTENBERG justly claims for this passage, as well as for ver. 7 and chap.

Digitized by Google

ix. 11 (and also for Zech. v. 1), the acceptance of וְשַׁבְתִּי אֲנִי וָאֶרְאֶה in the sense of: "And I turned back and saw," which is the same as: "And again I saw" (EWALD), and indicates the transition to a new object of reflection, not the repetition of a reflection already made, as HAHN contends. LUTHER, ELSTER, VAIHINGER, *etc.*, are not correct in saying: "And I turned," *etc.*; for שׁוּב expresses a sense different from פָּנָה or סָבַב (ii. 12, 20, *etc.*).—**And considered all the oppressions.**—As in Amos iii. 9, עֲשֻׁקִים must here also be taken in an abstract sense: "oppressions," "violence;" for נַעֲשִׂים does not harmonize with the concrete sense, "oppressed," whilst in the following clause the concrete sense "oppressed" appears from the context.—**And behold the tears of such as were oppressed.**—In the original, tear of the oppressed (דִּמְעָה a collective). The description presents a vivid reality, and does not magnify the actual conditions in a fantastic or sentimental manner, or from a bitter and peevish misanthropy, but simply reports facts; and facts such as the author had frequently experienced in consequence of the civilly dependent and depressed condition of his people.—**And on the side of their oppressors there was power.**—כֹּחַ here is equal to חָזְקָה (1 Sam. ii. 16; Ezek. xxxiv. 4) violence. The repetition of the expression, "*but they had no comforter*," realizes, with striking emphasis, the hopeless and desperate condition of those who suffer. Comp. the similar repetitions of the same tragic turn in Isa. ix. 11, 16, 20; x. 4; Mark ix. 44, 46, 48.—Ver. 2. **Wherefore I praised the dead which are already dead.**—שַׁבֵּחַ is not a participle with מ omitted, but an infinitive absolute, which here contains the finite verb, as in chap. ix. 11, and in 1 Chron. v. 20 (comp. BERTH. on this passage, and also EWALD, § 351 *c*).—**More than the living which are yet alive.**—עֲדֶנָה contracted from עַד־הֵנָּה, עַד הֵן *adhuc, yet.* For the sentence comp. vii. 1 f.; also Herodotus i. 81: *ἄμεινον ἀνθρώπῳ τεθνάναι μᾶλλον ἢ ζώειν*, as also ver. 6 of MENANDER: *Ζωῆς πονηρᾶς θάνατος αἱρετώτερος.*—Ver. 3. **Yea, better is he than both they, which hath not been.**—For this intensifying of the previous thought, comp. chap. vi. 3-5; vii. 1; Job iii. 13 ff.; Jer. xx. 18, and THEOGNIS, *Gnom.*, v. 425 ss.:

> *Πάντων μὲν μὴ φῦναι ἐπιχθονίοισιν ἄριστον,*
> *Μηδ' ἐσιδεῖν αὐγὰς ὀξέος ἠελίου,*
> *Φύντα δ', ὅπως ὤκιστα πύλας 'Αΐδαο περῆσαι,*
> *Καὶ κεῖσθαι πολλὴν γῆν ἐπαμησάμενον.*

Other parallels will be found in the classic authors, as SOPHOCLES (*Œd. Col.*, 1148 s.), EURIPIDES. (*Cresphontes fragm.* 13) CHALCIDAMUS, POSIDIPP., PHILEMON, VAL. *Maxim.* II. 6; SOLINUS (*Polyhist*, c. 10), *etc.* Examine also KNOBEL on this passage, and HENGSTENBERG, p. 160 f. The difference between such complaints in heathen authors, and the same in the mouth of our own, is found in the fact that the latter, like Job and Jeremiah, does not stop at the gloomy reflections expressed in the lamentation, but, by proceeding to expressions of a more cheerful nature,* announces that the truth found in them is incomplete, and only partial.—Ver. 4. Again—**I considered all travail and every right work.**—כִּשְׁרוֹן, as in ii. 21, not of the successful result of work, but of its excellence in kind and manner; the Septuagint is correct: *ἀνδρεία*, and mainly so the Vulgate: *industriæ.* But it is clear that the author is thinking mainly of such excellent and industrious people whose exertions are crowned with success, so that they can become objects of envy or jealousy. He is therefore now no longer regarding simply the unhappy and the suffering, as in vers. 1-3, but also the relatively happy.—**That for this a man is envied of his neighbor.**—[קִנְאַת אִישׁ מֵרֵעֵהוּ] *i. e.*, jealous endeavor to anticipate another in available effort and corresponding success; consequently envious disposition and action, *invidia* (comp. ix. 6, where קִנְאָה has the same meaning, and also Isa. xi. 13, *etc.*).—**This is also vanity.**—Because in the uncertainty of all earthly circumstances, it is of no true profit to surpass one's

*[There is a still more striking contrast, a double antithesis, it may be said, between the classical and the Scriptural poets. In their descriptions of nature and of human life we often find the former class of writers beginning in the joyful or major mood, and ending in the minor. It may be called the melancholy of Epicureanism. Thus it is with ANACREON, though he lived before the time of the sensual philosopher. How often does he begin with "flowers, and love, and rosy wine"—

> Επὶ μυρσίναις τερείναις
> Επὶ λωτίναις τε ποίαις κ. τ. λ.
>
> On beds of softest fragrance laid,
> Soft beds of lote and myrtle shade.

And so goes on the joyful strain—but not far before the modulation changes into the mournful key—into a wail of despair, as it would almost seem:

> *βιότος τρέχει κυλισθείς·*
> *ὀλίγη δὲ κεισόμεσθα.*
>
> So swiftly runs the wheel of life,
> And we shall lie—a *little dust*—
> A heap of mouldering bones.

See also how similar jovial strains are closed by his sad picture of old age, and the still darker one of the dreadful Hades:

> *'Αΐδεω γὰρ ἐστι δεινὸς*
> *καθόδος*———
>
> For dreadful is that gloomy vale;
> And then the dark descent so deep,
> That none can reascend the steep.

This peculiarity is no less striking in HORACE. Thus, in the 4th ode of the 1st Book, there is a most charming picture of spring, continuing for some distance, till it closes with the exulting strain—

> *Nunc decet aut viridi nitidum caput impedire myrto;*
> *Aut flore terræ quam ferunt solutæ.*

And then, without any warning prelude, there comes the mournful minor:

> *Pallida mors æquo pulsat pede pauperum tabernas,*
> *Regumque turres.*
>
> Pale Death, with equal step, at kingly tower,
> And at the poor man's cottage, knocks.

Again, Ode 7th, Lib. IV., commencing with—

> *Diffugere nives, redeunt jam gramina campis.*
>
> The snows are fled, the flowers again return.

Then the picture of the dancing Graces, when immediately a different voice seems to meet our ears:

> *Immortalia ne speres,*———
> *Damna tamen celeres reparant cœlestia lunæ*—
> *Nos ubi decidimus,*
> *Pulvis et umbra sumus:*
>
> Hope not for immortality———
> The waning moons again their waste repair;
> But we, when once to death gone down,
> Are nought but *dust* and *shadow*.

Digitized by Google

neighbor in diligence and skill.—Ver. 5. **The fool foldeth his hands together, and eateth his own flesh.**—Probably a proverb of like tendency with those of Prov. vi. 10; xxiv. 33, *i. e.*, directed against idleness; it is therefore not the expression of the author, but a quotation of an envious person who endeavors to defend his zealous effort to surpass his neighbor in excellence, but which is immediately refuted in ver. 6. HITZIG is correct in this view (comp. also the *Int.*, § 1, Obs. 2), whilst LUTHER, GEIER, OETINGER, BAUER, VAIHINGER, *etc.*, see rather the *jealous man* designated as a fool, who folds his hands in vexation and despair, and consumes his own flesh in wild passion, and EWALD, HENGSTENBERG, ELSTER, *etc.*, think that the author is contrasting idleness with envy as its opposite extreme, in order to warn against the former; this were manifestly to presuppose a very abrupt and obscure mode of presentation. Concerning the phrase "foldeth his hands" as a Biblical expression for idleness, comp. Prov. vi. 10. "Eateth his own flesh" is to exhaust one's strength, to use one's fortune, to ruin one's self, as occurs on the part of the idle; comp. Isa. xlix. 26; Ps. xxvii. 2; Micah iii. 3; Numb. xii. 12.—Ver. 6. **Better is a handful with quietness, than both hands full with travail and vexation of spirit.**—This is plainly * the answer which a defender of a contented, quiet spirit, void of envy, would give to that feverish jealousy which in ver. 5 he had rebuked as foolish indolence, the disposition not to rival one's neighbor in skill and diligence.—מְלֹא כַף, lit., "to be filled, to be full of hand." It means "a little," as taken in contrast with מְלֹא חָפְנַיִם "both hands full," *i. e.*, superfluity of any thing, great abundance. "Quiet" (נַחַת) and so also עָמָל "travail," do naturally present, not only the respective dispositions and demeanors, but, at the same time, the casual circumstances connected with them, and forming their background; at one time a modest portion of worldly goods, at another a great fortune, collected with much exertion, but bringing only care and sorrow.

8. *Second strophe.* Vers. 7-12. By avarice, the nearest relative and affiliated vice of the envy just described, man brings himself into sad isolation and abandonment of friends, which is the greatest misfortune in social life, as it not only embitters all enjoyment of the amenities of this life, but robs us of all protection against men of hostile intent. For ver. 7 compare what is said above of ver. 1.—Ver. 8. **There is one alone, and there is not a second**—*i. e.*, one standing entirely alone, without friends and companions, also without near blood relations (according to the following clause), consequently so much the more isolated and obliged to make friends by the free use of his riches, but which he does not do. —**Neither is his eye satisfied with riches**, *i. e.*, he does not cease to crave new treasures; comp. ii. 10. The K'tib עֵינָיו must be retained, and need not be exchanged for עֵינוֹ. Comp. 1 Sam. iv. 15; 1 Kings xiv. 6, 12; Ps. xxxvii. 31.—**For whom do I labor and bereave my soul of good?**—Lit., "let my soul fail of the good," a pregnant construction like that in Ps. x. 18; xviii. 19. This question is put into the mouth of the covetous, but as one finally arriving at reflection, and perceiving the folly of his thus collecting treasures; comp. ii. 18-21; Luke xii.

In contrast with this, how joyfully rings out the prophetic strain, Isaiah xxvi. 19:

Awake and sing, ye dwellers in the dust.

How different, too, in these respects, from HORACE and ANACREON, are the lyrics of the Psalmist. The most mournful descriptions of the frailty and transitory state of man on earth are so frequently succeeded by assurances of some future blessedness, which, although not clearly defined, and containing little or no direct allusions to an after life, do ever seem to imply it as the ground of confidence in the Divine goodness. "He is not the God of the dead, but of the living." Thus in the ciii. Psalm, ver. 15, *etc.*:

Frail man—like grass his days;
As the flower of the field, so he flourishes.
For the wind passes over, and it is gone;
Its place knoweth it no more.

Immediately hope rises:

But the mercy of the Lord is from everlasting—
Even unto everlasting, upon those who fear him;
His righteousness to children's children.

Again,—encouragement in the contemplation of human weakness is derived from the thought of the Divine permanence and eternity, Ps. cii. 1:

My days are like a shadow that declineth;
I am withered like grass;
But thou, Jehovah, dost endure forever.
Thy remembrance unto all generations.

Again, Ps. cxv. 17:

The dead praise not the Lord———

and immediately the language of hope, implying something more than that mere selfish thought of survivorship, which the rationalist would give it:

But *we* will bless the Lord,
From henceforth and forever—hallelujah.

A similar transition, Ps. lxxiii. 26:

My *flesh* and *heart* do fail:

Body and soul both suffer from their connection with a fallen spiritual state, and a degenerate nature.

But God is the rock of my soul;
He is my portion for ever.

Similar illustrations of these affecting contrasts might be derived from Job, as in chapters xiv. and xix., especially the latter, where the triumphant strain, "I know that my Redeemer liveth," follows so soon after what might seem almost a piteous cry of despair. In Koheleth there are no such vivid bursts of joy and hope, but there is to be found in him a species of transition similar, and equally striking. It is when he rises from the seemingly doubting mood, to a firm faith in the ultimate Divine justice, and to a most confident expression of his belief that somehow, and somewhere, and at some time, every wrong shall be righted. Conceding to him this, we are led, irresistibly, to infer something else which is necessary to give meaning to the announcement.—namely, that there shall be a real *forensic* manifestation, with a conscious knowledge of it on the part of every intelligent subject, or object, of such righteousness.—T. L.]

* [This is not so clear, although ZÖCKLER has with him most of the commentators. There is good reason for regarding it as the language of the idle envier, who would justify his sloth by making a pretended virtue of it. "Why all this labor? Better take the world easy." It has something of the look of the "sour grapes" fable; or it may be compared to the bacchanalian song of the shiftless idler, assuming to despise what he has not the talent nor the diligence to acquire:

"Why are we fond of toil and care?"

The view taken by ZÖCKLER and others seems very confused. It is not easy to discover any true connection in it. The perplexity, we think, comes from assuming that ver. 5 is a quoted proverb, and not the very language of the author, setting the idle envious fool and his words (in ver. 6) in contrast with the diligent and prosperous laborer whom the fool envies but cannot imitate. This is the view presented in the Metrical Translation:

The fool [in envy] folds his hands, and his own flesh devours.
For better [saith he] is the one hand filled with quietness,
Than both hands full of toil, and windy vain desire.

It seems to make a clearer connection.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

16-21. But it does not follow from this sudden revulsion from foolish to sensible views, without further explanation, that Koheleth means himself (as above chap. ii. 18 ff.) in the person here described (as HITZIG contends).—Ver. 9. **Two are better than one.**—That is, it is better, in general, to be associated than isolated, comp. Gen. ii. 18, and the saying of the Talmud: "A man without companions is like the left without the right hand" (*Pirke Aboth*, f. 30, 2).—**Because they have a good reward for their labor.**—Lit., who have a good reward for their labor. What this good reward consists of, the three subsequent verses show by three examples, which point out, in a similar manner, the pleasure as well as the profit and protection afforded by socially living and cordially co-operating with one's fellows.—Ver. 10. **For if they fall**, *i. e.*, the one or the other. We cannot think of both falling at the same time, because they then would both need aid.—**But woe to him that is alone when he falleth.**—אִי לוֹ "woe to him!" comp. אִי לָךְ x. 16, and also the kindred הִי Ezek. ii. 10.—Ver. 11. **If two lie together, then they have heat.**—The conjugal lying together of man and wife is certainly not intended, but rather that of two travelling companions who are obliged to pass the night in the open air. The necessity of this in Palestine,* on account of the prevalence of cold nights there, can easily cause great embarrassment, especially as poorer travellers have no other covering with them than their over-garment; comp. Ex. xxii. 26; Song of Solomon, v. 8.—Ver. 12. **And if one prevail against him.**—תקף means to overcome (comp. the adjective תַּקִּיף powerful, vi. 10), not to attack (KNOBEL, ELSTER), or fall upon (EWALD). יִתְקְפוֹ is an indefinite singular with an object presupposed in the suffix: "if one overwhelmed him, the one;" comp. 2 Sam. xiv. 6; Prov. xiii. 24; and Eccles. ii. 21, which passages satisfactorily show that EWALD's proposition to read יִתְקְפוֹ is unnecessary.—(Comp. EWALD, *Lehrbuch*, § 309 *c*).—**Two shall withstand him.**—Of course not the one mentioned in the first part, but rather his opponent, who forms the unnamed subject in יִתְקְפוֹ. Comp. similar cases in chap. v. 18; vi. 12; viii. 16; as well as the phrase עָמַד נֶגֶד "to oppose somebody," to resist one; 2 Kings x. 4; Dan. viii. 7. EWALD and ELSTER are not so correct in saying: "thus stand two before him," namely, the attacked one himself and his companion—which clearly affords too weak a thought.—**And a threefold cord is not quickly broken.**—That is, if three of them, instead of two, hold together, then so much the better. The symbol is taken from the fact that a cord of three strands holds more firmly than one consisting of a simple strand, or of two only. Comp. the well-known fable of a bundle of arrows, and the German proverb: "Strong alone, but stronger with others." There is no allusion to the sacredness of the number three, and still less to the Trinity, which a few older commentators thought to find herein. Moreover, the title of several books of devotion is derived from this passage, *e. g.*, the celebrated book of the Priest of Rostock, NIKOLAUS RUSS, about the year 1500: *de triplici funiculo*, in which faith, hope and love are described as the three cords of which there must be made the rope that is to rescue man from the abyss of ruin. And so of later works, as (LILIENTHAL) "A Threefold Cord," a book of proverbs for every day in the year (for every day a saying containing a promise and a prayer.)—New. Ed., Hamburg, Sigmund. A threefold cord, woven out of the three books of ST. AUGUSTINE: *Manuale, Soliloquia, et Meditationes*, 1863. 4. *Third strophe.*—Vers. 8–16. That fortune often shows itself deceptive and unreliable enough in civil life, and in the highest spheres of human society, is illustrated by the double example of an old incapable king whom a younger person pushes aside, and that of his successor, an aspirant from a lower class, who, in spite of his transitory popularity, nevertheless falls into forgetfulness, like so many others. Like the fact alluded to in chap. ix. 13–16, this example seems to be taken from the immediate contemporary experiences of the author, but can only, with great difficulty, be more nearly defined on its historical basis. Only the first clause of ver. 18 suits the history of Joseph, and, at most, ver. 13 contains an allusion to David as the successor of Saul; ver. 15 may allude to Rehoboam as successor of Solomon, and ver. 14 perhaps to Jeroboam. But other features again destroy these partial resemblances every time, and demonstrate the impossibility of discovering any one of these persons in the "poor but wise youth." Thus, too, the remaining hypotheses that have been presented concerning the enigmatical fact (*e. g.*, the references to Amaziah and Joash, and to Nimrod and Abraham), can only be sustained by the most arbitrary applications. This is especially true of HITZIG's supposition that the old and foolish king is the Onias mentioned by Josephus (Antiquities xii. 4) as High Priest and προστάτης τοῦ λαοῦ, and that the youth supplanting him was his sister's son, Joseph, who, if he did not succeed in robbing him of the priestly office (which his son Simon inherited) [see Sirach l. 1 ff], at least wrested from him the προστασία, *i. e.*, the lucrative office of a farmer of the Syrian revenues that he had then exercised twenty-two years, not indeed to the satisfaction of the people, but in a very selfish and tyrannical manner. This hypothesis does all honor to the learned acumen of its originator, but has so many weak points as to forbid its acceptance. For in the first place the ruler of a realm is portrayed in vers. 15 and 16, and not a rich Judaic-Syrian revenue collector; secondly, Onias was high-priest and not king, and lost only a part of his functions and power by that Joseph; thirdly, the assumption that the author exaggerates petty circumstances and occurrences in a manner not historical, is destitute of the necessary proof; fourthly, the supposition forming

*[One of the best illustrations of this is to be found in Captain KANE's *Journal* of his *Arctic Voyage*, Vol. II., p. 144. He describes his camping out on the snow, in company with the Esquimaux Chief, KALATUNAH, and the agreeable warmth arising from the close contact of their bodies, at a time when the thermometer showed a most intense degree of cold. The comfort of the position overbalanced all the repulsiveness that, under other circumstances, he should have felt towards his squalid companion.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

the base of the entire hypothesis of an authorship of Koheleth towards the end of the third century B. C. is quite as arbitrary and bare of proof; comp. Int., § 4, Obs. 3. We must, therefore, refrain from specially defining the event to which these verses allude; in which case the two following suppositions remain possible: either the author feigns an example, or, in other words, has presented the contents of vers. 13-16 as a possible case (thus think ELSTER, HENGSTENBERG, VAIHINGER, *et al.*), or he refers to an event in the history of the nation or State, at his period, not sufficiently known to us (the opinion of UMBREIT, EWALD, BLEEK, *etc.*). In the latter case, we could hardly think of a change of succession in the series of Persian monarchs; for the history of the rise of the eunuch Bagoas about the year 339 B. C. harmonizes too little with the present description to be identified with it, but we would sooner think of such a change in some one of the States subject to Persia, as Phenicia or Egypt.—**Better is a poor and wise child,** *etc.*—Clearly a general sentence for the introduction of the following illustration: "better" not here said of moral excellence, but "happier," "better off," just as טוֹב in vers. 3 and 9. "Wise" here is equivalent to "adroit, cunning," comp. Job v. 13; 2 Sam. xiii. 3.—**Who will no more be admonished.**—יָדַע לְ with the infinitive, as v. 1; vi. 8; x. 16; Ex. xvii. 16.—Ver. 14. **For out of prison he cometh to reign.**—בֵּית הָסוּרִים contracted from בֵּית הָאֲסוּרִים (comp. similar contractions in 2 Chron. xxii. 5; Ezek. xx. 30), also synonymous with בֵּית אֲסִירִים, Judges xvi. 21, 25 (comp. Gen. xxxix. 20). Or else this reading הָסוּרִים must owe its origin to the opinion that Joseph's elevation from the prison to the throne (Gen. xli.) is here alluded to, in which case we should read בֵּית הַסּוּרִים, and explain this either by "house of the outcast" "of the degraded" (EWALD, comparing Isa. xlix. 21), or "by house of the fugitives" (HITZIG, comparing Judges iv. 18; 2 Sam. iii. 36). But these varied meanings would produce very little difference in the sense. —**Whereas also he that is born in his kingdom becometh poor.**—כִּי גַם, after the כִּי of the preceding clause, introduces not so much a verification of it, as an intensification, by which is expressed that the prisoner (or fugitive) has not merely transiently fallen into adversity, but that he was born in poor and lowly circumstances; and this בְּמַלְכוּתוֹ "in his kingdom," *i. e.*, in the same land that he should afterwards rule as king (HITZIG, ELSTER, VAIHINGER and EWALD, who are mainly correct). ROSENMUELLER, KNOBEL and HAHN translate: "ALTHOUGH he was born poor in his kingdom;" HENGSTENBERG: "*for although* born in his kingdom, he becomes poor nevertheless"—both of them less suitable meanings, of which the latter should be rejected as too artificial and contrary to the accentuation.—Ver. 15. **I considered all the living which walk under the sun, with the second child,** *etc.*—A somewhat inflated description of the dominion and adherents which that youth (or child) had acquired. For the same child is doubtless meant as that named in vers. 13 and 14, as the repetition of the expression יֶלֶד shows, as well as the words אֲשֶׁר יַעֲמֹד תַּחְתָּיו at the end, which indicate clearly enough the prospective introduction of the child into the place of the old and foolish king. The imperfect יַעֲמֹד marks the future in the past—comp. 2 Kings iii. 27; Ps. lxxviii. 6; and עָמַד in the same sense, as *e. g.*, (Dan. xi. 2, 3). HAHN, in connection with some older writers, considers the יֶלֶד הַשֵּׁנִי different from the יֶלֶד in ver. 13, and identifies it with the Messiah child or the Christ child of Isa. ix. 5; xi. 1 ff.; Micah v. 1; but the contents of the following verse, which characterizes the splendor of the child most clearly as transitory and vain, are very decidedly against this position as something that would never be in accordance with the rule of the Messiah.—And moreover, from the expression: "All the living which walk under the sun," it is by no means necessary to deduce that the author had in his eye one of the great Asiatic empires, as HENGSTENBERG supposes with reference to Dan. iv. 7 ff.; but the language here, as in the following verse, is largely hyperbolical, and is intended merely to give an idea of the numberless masses adhering to the usurper; comp. similar hyperboles in the Song of Sol. vi. 8; Joshua xi. 4; Judges vi. 5; vii. 12; Ex. x. 4 ff.—**There is no end of all the people, even of all that have been before them.**—הָיָה לִפְנֵי denotes here, as in 1 Sam. xviii. 16; 2 Chron. i. 10, the headship or leadership (comp. also Micah ii. 13). [ZÖCKLER says this to support his translation, *an deren Spitze er stand*, "all at whose head he stood," notwithstanding all the connections of the passage show that priority in time is meant here by לִפְנֵיהֶם, and not priority of position. The references he makes to 1 Sam. xviii. 16, *etc.*, do not, at all, sustain him, since, in every one of them, there are other words (such as "going in and out before them"), which wholly change the case.—T. L.]. EWALD, following the Sept., Vulg., and LUTHER, translate: "*all that have been before them*," and indicate an antagonism between these earlier ones and those immediately after called אַחֲרוֹנִים but he thereby violates the connection, which clearly shows that the generations later, not those earlier than the king in question, were compared with him. It is said of them גַּם not לֹא יִשְׂמְחוּ־בוֹ —**They also that come after shall not rejoice in him.**—That is, they have no pleasant experiences of him whom they once greeted with joyful hopes, either that he deceived the just hopes of his people by later misrule, or that the fickle breeze of popularity became untrue to him without his fault. In either case, Koheleth could and must find a confirmation of his favorite expression concerning the vanity of earthly things. This clause is therefore again composed of the strain with which he closes his reflections.

Digitized by Google

[Alleged Historical Allusions in Koheleth.—See the general remarks on the passages here alluded to, in the Appendix to the Introduction, p. 80. The older commentators who were firm in respect to the Solomonic origin, first began this kind of speculation. The Jewish Rabbis were excessively absurd in some of their midrashin. And so the older Christian interpreters were very fond of treating such passages as describing real historical events. They referred them to Rehoboam, Jeroboam, Joseph, Abraham, or any body else, because they thought it for the honor of the book, or of the Scriptures generally; as, in this way, one part confirmed another. The attempts to verify such hypotheses, however, only led to confusion, and tended rather to discredit than to increase confidence in the production. What was still worse, the Rationalists, whose interest it was to bring the book down to a very late date, began, in like manner, to use these supposed references for their own purposes. The result has been a still greater confusion; and the great difficulty of making any thing clear out of them, ought to satisfy every sober mind of the falsity of the entire historical theory. Regarded as general illustrations, they are in perfect harmony with the authorship of Solomon; whilst the attempts of another kind show the insuperable difficulty of settling upon any other date than the one claimed in the book itself. The most extravagant hypothesis is that of Hitzig, as is shown by Zöckler and Stuart. A priest has to be turned into a king, and when even that fails, the taking away of a very subordinate office is to be treated as a dethronement. What an outcry would be made by Ewald and his school, should they find similar wrenchings of language and history in commentators called orthodox! As presented by Hitzig and others, it becomes all a mass of rationalistic confusion. Even if the author was of so late a date, he certainly means to personate the old king of Israel. He must, therefore, himself have been "old and foolish," or consistency would have kept him from using as an illustration an incident so evidently anachronistic, as compared with any historical example likely to be given by Solomon. A writer assuming to personate some one in the days of Queen Elizabeth, and then using an illustration, insignificant in itself, and savoring wholly of the time of Gladstone, Bright, and Queen Victoria, would not have acted more absurdly.

The confusion and difficulty which such a mode of treatment (whether by Orthodox or Rationalist) has made in the interpretation of ver. 13, have been greatly increased by a wrong translation of ver. 14th. It has been most commonly held that the pronoun in מַלְכוּתוֹ (*his* kingdom) refers to the young man, and נוֹלָד, to some one, or to the subjects generally, born under his usurped power. This certainly destroys the contrast which the arrangement and the particles of the two verses seem to intend. Again, נוֹלָד (as a participle), or נוּלַד, has been taken as referring to the young man himself, born in *his*, that is, the old man's, kingdom—said young usurper himself afterwards becoming poor. Such seems to be Zöckler's view partially. All sorts of twists are resorted to by others to make this applicable to Jeroboam, or Hitzig's "young man" Joseph, or to somebody else. Our E. V. is ambiguous as to which is meant, and leaves the sense in total darkness. There is a striking contrast intended here, as is shown by the order of the words, and the particles כִּי גַּם. There is meant to be the most direct antithesis, as best illustrating such a vicissitude of fortune. The one born to a throne and becoming poor, is put in strongest contrast with the one born in obscurity and rising to power: "For out of prison (out of servitude or some condition of restraint, it may be actual imprisonment) the *one* comes forth to reign, whilst the *other*, though born in his kingdom (in his royal state), becomes a pauper." The particle גַּם has an emotional force; it expresses astonishment at such a case: *yea, more—what is stranger still*—"the royally born becomes poor." There is good authority for such a view, although most of the commentators wander after something else. The Vulgate renders it most clearly and literally: *De carcere et catenis quis egrediatur interdum ad regnum, et alius, natus in regno, inopia consumatur:* "From prison and from chains one may sometimes come forth to a kingdom, whilst another born in a kingdom may be reduced to want." It is clear, from the mode of expression, that the Latin translator looked upon it as a general illustration of the changes in human fortune. A still better authority is the old Greek Version of Symmachus, the best of the Greek interpreters: 'Ο ΜΕΝ *γὰρ ἐκ φυλακῆς ἐξῆλθε βασιλεῦσαι*, 'Ο ΔΕ, *καίπερ βασιλεὺς γεννηθέις, ἐστιν ἐνδεής:* "*The one* comes from prison to reign, *the other*, born a king, becomes needy." This is confirmed by the Syriac translation of Origen's *Hexapla*, which follows the Greek of Symmachus, word for word. See it as given in the Syriac marginal translations to Middledorpf's edition of the *Codex Syriaco-hexaplaris*.

Ver. 15. "I beheld all the living walking beneath the sun," *etc.* Zöckler may well call this "a somewhat inflated description of the dominion which that youth had acquired." It is indeed *überschwänglich*, high-flown, most extravagant, as thus applied; and the thought should have shown him that there must be something false in the application. It is barely suggested by what was said before (ver. 14) about the vicissitudes of the individual life, but has no other connection with it. It is a rising of the view to a higher scale, so as to take in the world, or race at large, and its olamic vicissitudes, as they might be called. רָאִיתִי, I saw, I surveyed, or contemplated. It is presented as a picture of the mind taking in not single events, but *all the living*, כָּל הַחַיִּים. No where else in the Bible is this most sweeping language applied to such narrow uses as are here supposed. Where it is not used abstractly for life, as the plural חַיִּים often is, it is never found in any less sense than the human race, or of the living as opposed to the dead. Comp. Job xxviii. 12; Isaiah viii. 20, "Land of the living," Ps. lvi.; cxlii. 6, "Light

Digitized by Google

of the living," similar expressions, Ps. cxvi. 9; also Eccles. vi. 8; ix. 5, and other places. Here כל joined with it (and it is the only place where it is so joined) makes it still more difficult to restrict it to such a narrow sense. The language rises beyond this: "I surveyed, I contemplated, all the living, as they walked beneath the sun," *cunctos viventes ambulantes sub sole.* These are certainly very lofty words to apply to a crowd running after Jeroboam, or Hitzig's ambitious youth, or any other personage of that kind. No artificial rule of criticism, *de universalibus restringendis, etc.*, can justify the use of such language, in such a case. The true idea, moreover, is intensified by the participle מְהַלְּכִים, *in piel, marching, stately stepping*, denoting a bold and proud movement, as in Eccles. xi. 9 הַלֵּךְ "march on in the ways of thine heart." The *piel* does, indeed, seem, sometimes, to be used like the *kal*, but here every thing calls for its intensive or frequentative force. Comp. מְהַלֵּךְ, the *bold invader*, Prov. vi. 11, in parallelism with אִישׁ מָגֵן "man of the shield." In this intensive sense of *marching* it would seem to picture the grand procession of the race, moving on, squadron after squadron, the countless multitude that has already passed, עִם הַיֶּלֶד הַשֵּׁנִי, together "with the second generation," as we do not hesitate to render it, that shall stand in its place,—the עם here simply denoting the connection between the different parts of the picture or survey. The old procession that he thus *saw* walking *beneath the sun* (a term every where else used for the theatre of the human race), or the old part of it, is disappearing, whilst a younger world is now coming upon the stage and continuing the same ceaseless movement. As this rises before the mental vision of the seer [הָרֹאֶה], he cries out, אֵין קֵץ לְכָל הָעָם "there is no end to all the people,"—there is no numbering the ranks of this vast host, as they ever come and go. As applied to Jeroboam, such language as this would not be a mere hyperbole, but a transcendental bombast, unworthy of the author and his most serious book. It calls to mind that sublime picture which Addison presents in his *Vision of Mirza*, the countless multitudes on the broken bridge of life, as they are ever coming out of the dark cloud on the one side, and passing away with the great flood of eternity on the other. It is this evident pictorial element in the verse, when rightly rendered, that strongly opposes the idea of any such comparatively petty historical references, and forces us to regard it as a representation of the great human movement through time into eternity. "*No end to all that were before;* yea, these that come after shall not rejoice in *it*" [בּוֹ] that is, the עָם the people, *the all*, that were before it, now regarded collectively as the past in whom there is no more delight,—each generation satisfied with itself, and boasting of itself, as ours does, deeming itself, as it were, the all on earth; for what are all the ages past to this nineteenth century! Now the pronoun in תַּחְתָּיו though singular in form, may have a collective antecedent, a case too common in the Hebrew language to require citations. The only antecedent of this kind, or of any kind, in the verse, is the אֶת-כָּל-הַחַיִּים *the all of the living*, and which the makkephs, and the accents, show to be taken as one: "all the living, *etc.*, with the second generation that shall arise in *its* stead." The evident parallelism favors this choice of the singular pronoun; but if we are to overlook all this for the purpose of maintaining a historical reference, then we must go back two verses, and find the antecedent in "the old and foolish king," in whose place this second child, with "all the living beneath the sun, and the people without end," marching with him, is to stand! The common sense of the reader must judge in this matter. If, then, the pronoun in תַּחְתָּיו has for its antecedent the אֶת-כָּל-הַחַיִּים, grammatical consistency would demand, as the antecedent of the pronoun in בּוֹ (in *it*, instead of in *him*), the כֹּל אֲשֶׁר just before, especially as joined with the singular substantive verb הָיָה. Besides the desire to find historic allusions, two verbal peculiarities here seem to have had much influence upon translators. One is the use of this singular pronoun which has just been explained, and which the parallelism of the picture so strongly demands. The other is the somewhat peculiar use of the word יֶלֶד in ver. 15, and its contiguity to יֶלֶד in ver. 13, leading to the false inference that they must be used in precisely the same manner. Now though the use of יֶלֶד for generation is not found elsewhere in the Bible Hebrew, yet it is perfectly natural and in harmony with the frequent generic use of בֵּן. It is, too, highly poetical, thus to regard one generation as the offspring, the child, of the preceding. It is only using יֶלֶד for the cognate תּוֹלָדָה from the same root, and the unusual expression may have been suggested by the יֶלֶד in ver. 13, giving such a turn to the thought and the language. The order of ideas would be this: as the "young man" succeeds the old, so does the young race succeed its progenitor. So the primary sense of γένος in Greek is *child, offspring*, and from this comes its use for *race, generation.* Whilst, then, it may be said that the word, etymologically, fits the thought, nothing could be more graphic than the mode of representation.

Agreeing with this is an interpretation given by that acute Jewish critic, Aben-Ezra, except that it takes the pronoun in בּוֹ as referring to the עוֹלָם or world, so frequently mentioned. After stating the other view, he proceeds to say: "There are those who interpret הַיֶּלֶד הַשֵּׁנִי the second child, as denoting the generation that comes after another (הדור הבא אחריו) and the meaning as being, that he saw the living as they walked beneath the sun, and they, with their heirs that shall stand in their place, are

Digitized by Google

like those who went before them, and these, as well as those, shall have no joy (בּוֹ) in *it*, that is, בעולם in the world." It is the same procession so curtly, yet so graphically, described ch. i. 4: "generation comes, and generation goes," לעולם. RASHI regards ילד as meaning generation, but strangely refers it to the generation of Noah, and the אחרנים or "they who come after," to that of Peleg.

The Hebrew preposition עם like the Latin *cum* and the English *with* when used for and, may denote a connection in thought, or in succession, as *prœterea*, *besides*, *as well as*, like the Arabic مَعًا: "I saw all the living walking, *etc.*, and together with, or along with them, or besides this, I saw the second generation." This is a well established use of the preposition. Comp. 1 Sam. xvii. 4 and xvi. 12: אדמוני עם יפה מראה "ruddy *as well* as fair," and in this book, ch. ii. 16, חכם עם הכסיל "the wise man as well as the fool," 1 Chron. xxv. 8, מבין עם תלמיד "teacher (with) as well as the disciple," Ps. cvi. 6, "we with our fathers," we *and* our fathers, or we *as well* as our fathers; also Neh. iii. 12; Ps. cxv. 13; Dan. xi. 8; Ps. civ. 25, "the great as well as the small," and other places. The great difficulty in the way of the common view is the word הַשֵּׁנִי. "The second child," "the child the second," must denote one of two or more. A concordance shows that there is no exception to this. To take it in the sense of *successor* to something of a different kind (a second one) is without an example to support it. No mention is made of any other "child," or "young man." The difficulty has led some to give השני the sense of חבר, *companion*, for which they seek a warrant in the 10th verse; and then they refer it to a son of Hiram, who was Solomon's friend or companion: "I saw the child (the son) of my friend." See Notes to Noldius Heb. Part. No. 1028. This is very absurd; and yet the one who defends it denounces the absurdity of the more common reference to Jeroboam. Whoever wishes to see "confusion on confusion heaped," in the treatment of these passages, and in the attempt to restrict the extent of this language, may consult DE DIEU, *Crit. Sac.*, p. 188. Take these verses, however, as general reflections on the vicissitudes of the *individual* and of the race, and all this confusion immediately gives place to harmony.—T. L.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

(*With Homiletical Hints.*)

Among the examples in proof of the imperfection and inconstancy of earthly happiness, which the Preacher communicates in the above section from the rich treasures of his own experience, we find the relation of an ascending grade from lower to higher and more brilliant conditions of happiness. From the sad lot of victims innocently suffering from tyrannical persecution and oppression (1-3), the description proceeds directly to the more lucky but not more innocent condition of persons consumed with envy, dissatisfaction and jealousy, and who with toilsome efforts chase after the treasures of this earth, looking with jealous envy on the successful rivals of their struggles, and with scorn on those less fortunate, who are contented with a more modest lot (4-6). Then follow reflections regarding the happiness of such persons as have risen through the abundance of their goods to a distinguished and influential position in human society, but who, in consequence of this very wealth, run the risk of falling into a helpless, joyless, and isolated condition, destitute of friends and adherents (vii. 12). The illustration hereby induced of the value of closer social connection of men, and harmonious co-operation of their powers to one end (9-12) leads to the closing reflection; this is devoted to the distress and disaster of the highest circles of human society, acknowledging the fate even of the most favored pets of fortune, such as the occupants of princely or kingly thrones, to be uncertain and liable to a reverse, and thus showing that the sentence against the vanity of all earthly things necessarily extends even to the greatest and most powerful of earth (13-16).

"*There is no complete and lasting happiness here below, neither among the lofty nor the lowly,*" or: "*Every thing is vanity on earth, the life of the poor as of the rich, of the slave as of the lord, of the subject as of the king;*"—this would be about the formula of a theme for a comprehensive consideration of this section. The effort of HENGSTENBERG to restrict the historical references of this section to the sufferings of the children of Israel mourning under the yoke of Persian dominion, is quite as unnecessary as the corresponding position in the preceding chapter; yet still the most of the concrete examples for the truth of the descriptions given, may be drawn from the history of post-exile Israel, which are therefore thus to be chosen and arranged in the homiletical treatment.

HOMILETICAL HINTS ON SEPARATE PASSAGES.

Vers. 1-3. BRENZ:—The word of God teaches us that crosses and sufferings pave the way to eternal bliss, and that the Lord grants to the wicked in this world a free hand for the exercise of their crimes and violence, with the view of sinking them ever deeper in their lusts; but it teaches also that the faith of the pious is to be maintained through suffering, and to be finally brought to light in the judgment of the last day, in the great decision of all things.

STARKE:—Thou miserable one, who sighest and weepest at violence and wrong, know that the Lord sees and counts thy tears (Ps. lvi. 9). Beware of impatience, distrust, and self-revenge against thy persecutors (Rom. xii. 19)!

HENGSTENBERG:—Such an experience of human misery (as is here depicted, and also in Jer. chap. xx.) is not only natural, but it lies in the purpose of God, who brings about the circumstances that call it forth. God wishes to draw us to Him, by making this world thoroughly distasteful, and nothing but vanity to us. We must be liberated from earthly things through many trials, and thus enter into the kingdom of heaven.

Digitized by Google

Vers. 4-6. BRENZ:—The world greatly errs in always demanding for its satisfaction a superfluity of goods and treasures, and in regarding modest possession as deprivation and misery. And yet one can live contented and satisfied just as well with a little as with rich superfluity, if one only aims, in a proper manner, after contentment, or in such a way that one lets God the Lord be his treasure and highest good.

GEIER:—One should not consider a rich man happier than a poor man, because of his many possessions. He who has much, has also much unrest and care, and is moreover greatly envied by others.

WOHLFARTH:—With true wisdom, Solomon warns us just as much against a passionate and excessive effort after a lofty aim, as against that indolence which folds its hands in its lap and waits for miracles. He admonishes us rather to a sober and well-ordered labor in our vocation, and thus, in every respect, recommends the just medium in our activity.

Vers. 7-12. MELANCHTHON:—Solomon here shows how necessary for human life is the social combination of men for the advancement of the arts, industries, and duties of life. All classes need such mutual aid and assistance, and each individual must prosecute his labor for the welfare of the whole, must advance their interest, and make every effort to prevent division and separation.

CRAMER (vers. 7 and 8):—The slaves of mammon are blinded, and are their own tyrants. They do not leave themselves space enough to enjoy their blessings; therefore the rust of their gold and silver is a testimony against them. (Jas. v. 3).

ZEYSS (vers. 9-12):—If a community of the body is so useful a thing, how much more useful must be a community of spirit, when pious Christians with united strength of spirit withstand the realms of Satan.

WOHLFARTH:—It is not merely a sacred desire that draws men to men, brings together souls of like inclination, and binds kindred hearts. We can neither rejoice in our happiness, nor finally bear the trials that meet us, nor joyfully advance in the way of piety and virtue, if we have not true friends. Oh how sacred, therefore, is the union of wedlock, of parents and children, of relatives and friends!

VON GERLACH:—Joy shared is two-fold joy; grief shared loses half its pain.

Vers. 13-16. BRENZ:—Faith has here a good probationary school, in which it can learn and try its powers. For when God elevates the lowly, faith can cherish hope, but when He bends and overthrows the proud necks of the rich, it learns to fear. God presents such examples to the eyes of His chosen, that they may increase and be exercised both in the fear of His holy wrath, and in hope of heavenly glory.

WEIMAR BIBLE:—We should never depend on large possessions and great power, and much less seek true happiness therein, Ps. lxxv. 5, 6.

STARKE:—It is a clear indication of Divine Providence, that in no place, and at no epoch, is there a failure of children and posterity to fill the places of the aged as they disappear.

C. Means for the Advancement of Earthly Happiness.

CHAP. V. 1–20.

1. First means: Conscientious devotion in the worship of God, in prayer and vows.

(VERS. 1–7.)

1 Keep thy foot when thou goest to the house of God, and be more ready to hear,
2 than to give the sacrifice of fools; for they consider not that they do evil. Be not
rash with thy mouth, and let not thine heart be hasty to utter *any* thing before
God: for God *is* in heaven, and thou upon earth: therefore let thy words be few.
3 For a dream cometh through the multitude of business; and a fool's voice *is known*
4 by multitude of words. When thou vowest a vow unto God, defer not to pay it;
5 for *he hath* no pleasure in fools: pay that which thou hast vowed. Better *is it* that
6 thou shouldest not vow, than that thou shouldest vow and not pay. Suffer not thy
mouth to cause thy flesh to sin; neither say thou before the angel, that it *was* an
error: wherefore should God be angry at thy voice, and destroy the work of thine
7 hands? For in the multitude of dreams and many words *there are* also *divers* vanities: but fear thou God.

Digitized by Google

2. Second means: Abstaining from injustice, violence, and avarice.

(Vers. 8–17.)

8 If thou seest the oppression of the poor, and violent perverting of judgment and
justice in a province, marvel not at the matter: for *he that is* higher than the high-
9 est regardeth; and *there be* higher than they. Moreover, the profit of the earth is
10 for all: the king *himself* is served by the field. He that loveth silver shall not be
satisfied with silver; nor he that loveth abundance with increase: this *is* also va-
11 nity. When goods increase, they are increased that eat them: and what good *is*
12 *there* to the owners thereof, saving the beholding *of them* with their eyes? The
sleep of a labouring man *is* sweet, whether he eat little or much: but the abun-
13 dance of the rich will not suffer him to sleep. There is a sore evil *which* I have
14 seen under the sun, *namely*, riches kept for the owners thereof to their hurt. But
those riches perish by evil travail: and he begetteth a son, and *there is* nothing in
15 his hand. As he came forth of his mother's womb, naked shall he return to go as
he came, and shall take nothing of his labour, which he may carry away in his
16 hand. And this also *is* a sore evil, *that* in all points as he came, so shall he go:
17 and what profit hath he that he hath laboured for the wind? All his days also he
eateth in darkness, and *he hath* much sorrow and wrath with his sickness.

3. Third means: Temperate and contented enjoyment of the pleasures and treasures of life granted by God.

(Vers. 18–20.)

18 Behold *that* which I have seen: *it is* good and comely *for one* to eat and to drink,
and to enjoy the good of all his labour that he taketh under the sun all the days
19 of his life, which God giveth him: for it *is* his portion. Every man also to whom
God hath given riches and wealth, and hath given him power to eat thereof, and
20 to take his portion, and to rejoice in his labour; this *is* the gift of God. For he
shall not much remember the days of his life; because God answereth *him* in the
joy of his heart.

[Chap. v. ver. 1. שְׁמֹר רַגְלֶיךָ in the Hebrew Bibles, the German and Dutch versions, the Vulgate, and some others, this is absurdly placed as the last verse of the iv. chapter. In the English, Tremellius, and others, it commences the v., where it evidently belongs; although the division of chapters, as given in this book is, in any way, of little value. The Masora has pointed רַגְלְךָ for the singular, corresponding to lxx. and Vulgate, though the sense is equally good in the plural. For the connection of this part with the preceding, consult Wordsworth, who sees in the train of thought, in all these remarks about rashness in the divine service, and in respect to vows and rash religious speaking, something closely connected with the true Solomonic experience, and therefore furnishing evidence of the Solomonic authorship of the book. As uttered by any one else, it would seem disconnected and chaotic, just as some critics have pronounced it. For remarks on קָרוֹב and מִתֵּת see Exeg. and Marginal Note.—T. L.]

[Ver. 6. לַחֲטִיא for לְהַחֲטִיא, *Hiph. Infinit.* הַמַּלְאָךְ see Exeg. and Marginal Note.—T. L.]

[Ver. 7. וּדְבָרִים, the same.—T. L.]

[Ver. 8. חֵפֶץ a very general and indefinite word, here rendered, in E. G., *matter* (thing), lxx. πράγματι, Vulgate *negotio*. It never, however, loses its sense of *purpose, will, etc.*, either as positive or permissive,—as it may be rendered here, *allowance*, God's *permission* of such a thing: see Met Version.—T. L.]

[Ver. 9. נֶעֱבָד. See Exeg. and Marg. Note.—T. L.]

[Ver. 10. רְאִית: The Keri has רְאוּת. It is one of those words in וּת that have been cited as evidence of a later language. It is, however, one of those more *studied* Solomonic words, denoting something philosophical, ethical, or abstract, demanded by the very subject and style of his writing. They are a higher class of words than were needed by the plainer historian, or prophet. They may have been invented by Solomon as to form (from old and common roots), and afterwards have become vulgarized in the later writings—thus giving rise to the later Aramaic forms, instead of having been derived from them: *Vision* of the eyes, a somewhat more polished, or loftier word, than the infinitive *to see*, or *sight*.—T. L.]

Ver. 16. רָעָה חוֹלָה: Gesenius makes חולה from חָלָה to be *sick, weak, etc.*, but this does not seem to give a sense strong enough. Rabbi Tanchum makes it from חול, to be *in great pain, torqueri doloribus*, and compares it with the participle מִתְחוֹלֵל (Jerem. xxiii. 19,) *overwhelming*, or a "*storm hurled* (סַעַר) on the head of the wicked"—a very sore and "*overwhelming evil*," is this, if man has to return just as he came, *e tenebris in tenebras, out of darkness into darkness*. See Tanchum *Comm.*, Lam. iv. 6. Same verse כָּל־עֻמַּת: The grammarian, Jona Ben Gannach, in his Sepher Harikma, p. 30, regards this as one word, or as an example of כ added (as it sometimes is with slight addition to the meaning) to לְעֻמַּת, (*as* in direct contrast). עֻמַּת is cited as one of the words *Sequioris Hebraismi*, but the root

Digitized by Google

עָמַם, although only occurring as a verb, Ezek. xxviii. 3; xxxi. 8, is very old in the language, as appears from עָם *people*, the preposition עִם *with*, עָמִית *society*, *companion*, all denoting, radically, *comparison*, one thing along with, or laid by the side of another (compare the Arabic عَمّ and many Greek words commencing with ὁμ such as ὁμός, ὅμως, ὁμῶς, ὁμοῖος, with their numerous derivatives, all implying *comparison*, *society*, *likeness*, *etc.*). This word עֻמָּה occurs in Exod. xxv. 27; xxviii. 27; Ezek. lxv. 7.

Ver. 18. אָנִי: [On the effect of the accent here see Exeg. and Marg. Note. The same on זֹה ver. 19.—T. L.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Of the three divisions of this section, the first two are divided each into two strophes of about equal length, and each of the two strophes of the second division, being very full in sense and rich in clauses, is again divided into two half strophes. The third division consists of only one not very comprehensive strophe. The complete scheme of the section stands, therefore, thus:—*I. Division: Of true piety;* a. (1 strophe): in worship and prayer, v. 1-3: b. (2 strophe): of vowing and the fulfilment of vows: vers. 4-7.—*II. Division: On avoiding various vices;* a, (1 half strophe): of injustice and violence: vers. 8, 9; b, (3-5, half-strophe): of avarice: vers. 10-17.—*III. Division: Of the temperate and thankfully contented enjoyment of life:* vers. 18-20, strophe 5.—VAIHINGER combines vers. 8-12, and then 13-20, each as a principal division or strophe, and overlooks the fact that the theme of avarice does not begin at verse 13, but at verse 10 (consequently with the first half strophe of strophe 3d, comprising vers. 8-12), and that, therefore, with verse 18, introduced by the words הִנֵּה אֲשֶׁר רָאִיתִי, begins an entirely new series of thoughts, which bears a concluding relation to the main contents of the chapter.

2. *First division, first strophe:* Chap. v. 1-3. Of true piety in the worship of God, and in prayer. **—Keep thy foot when thou goest to the house of God.** The k'tib רַגְלֶיךָ is to be preferred to the keri רַגְלְךָ. The latter appears to be modeled according to the passages in Prov. iv. 26; xxv. 17, and others, which present "foot" in the singular. For "feet" in the plural in similar expressions comp. Prov. i. 16; vi. 18; Ps. cxix. 59, *etc.* The sense of this exhortation is: "guard thy steps when thou goest to the house of the Lord, that thou mayest enter it with sacred composure, and carefully avoid everything that would interfere with thy devotion." See HENGSTENBERG: "The object is to preserve the heart, but as he goes, the heart receives its impressions, and is thus affected by it. The author doubtless speaks of the feet because by them has often been discovered the tendency of the heart." **And be more ready to hear,** *etc.* (*Ger.*, to approach in order to hear is better). The preposition מִן, without טוֹב, may in itself express the preference of one thing over another; comp. ix. 17; Isa. x. 10; Ezek. xv. 2.* קָרוֹב is not here for the imperative "be near," (LUTHER, HENGSTENBERG, *etc.*), but is an actual infinitive absolute, and as such subject of the sentence; comp. Prov. xxv. 27; Isa. vii. 15, 16. "*To hear*" does not mean to listen to the reading of the Thora during the service, (HITZIG) but "*to obey*, to regard the voice of God with the heart, to do His will;" comp. 1 Sam. xv. 22; Jer. vii. 23. We have here the same contrast between external sacrifice and holy intent as in Prov. xxi. 3, 27; Isa. i. 11 ff.; Hosea vi. 6, *etc.* **—Than to give the sacrifice of fools.** This sacrifice (זֶבַח) is specially pointed out from among the number of sacrifices, as also in Ps. xl. 6; Hosea vi. 6; 1 Sam. xv. 22. "To give the sacrifice," does not mean to give a sacrificial feast, (HITZIG), but to offer a sacrifice to God in order to satisfy him, or in order to appease one's conscience.—**For they consider not that they do evil.** Fools, whose sacrifice is an offence to God on account of their evil dispositions (comp. Prov. xxi. 27; and also the exegetical illustrations of this passage) do evil in sacrificing to Him, and nevertheless know it not, but rather suppose, in their folly, that their conduct is well pleasing to Him. As this thought (comp. Luke xxiii. 34) exactly fits the passage, and there is no linguistic difficulty in the explanation (for the construction אֵינָם יוֹדְעִים לַעֲשׂוֹת רָע, "they know not that they do evil," comp. Jer.

*[The examples that Zöckler gives of מִן comparative, without any comparative word before it, will not bear him out. In chap. ix. 17, it is dependent on נִשְׁמָעִים; in the other cases cited מִן is either partitive, or has its usual preposition sense. If any comparative word might be thus omitted it might be the familiar word טוֹב, but there are other ways of explaining the apparent grammatical anomaly without any such harshness, which would be like leaving out, in English, any comparative word before *than*—to hear *than* to give. If we regard קָרוֹב as an adjective it may have the sense of *fit*, *suitable*, *appropriate*, coming very easily from its primary and usual sense of nearness: to hear is more appropriate than to give; it is *nearer* in the sense of *better*. That such a connection of senses is natural, is shown from the Latin *prope propior*, as HORACE, *Sat.* I. 4. 42, *sermoni propiora*, *better for prose;* Terent. Heaut: *nulla alia delectatio quæ propior esset;* *Ovid. Met.*, *cura propior luctusqe.* It might be proved still more clearly from the Arabic use of a comparative from this very root (אַקְרַב=اَقْرَبُ) in the sense of *better*—that which is *nigher*, more appropriate. Of this there are frequent examples in the *Koran*, as in *Surat.* II. 238, اَقْرَب للتقوى *better* for piety, *more pious;* so xviii. 80, اَقْرَب رحما *better* for compassion, *more compassionate.* See also *Surat.* III. 160; iv. 12; v. 11; xvi. 79; xx. 13. Thus in Hebrew, קָרוֹב—מִתֵּת, *nearer*, more appropriate, more *acceptable* (a better קָרְבָּן or offering) than to give, *etc.*,—*audire propius esset quam dare*

Digitized by Google

xv. 15; 1 Kings xix. 4; Neh. xiii. 27) the renderings of the passage that vary from this are to be condemned. They are such as that of HAHN, (and many older commentators): "in their ignorance they can only do evil," or of KNOBEL and VAIHINGER: "They are not troubled about doing evil," or of HITZIG: "For they know not how to be sorrowful" (for which sense reference is made to 2 Sam. xii. 18; Isa. lvi. 12, *etc.*). The nearest to our view is that of the VULGATE, and of LUTHER: "for they know not what evil they do," which, however, cannot be philologically justified. Ver. 2. **Be not rash with thy mouth.** This censure of outward sacrifice is immediately followed by that of thoughtless words, and empty babbling in prayer, the next important element of divine worship in the temple. "To be rash with thy mouth" is essentially the same as that *βαττολόγειν* against which Christ warns us, perhaps with conscious reference to this passage, Matt. vi. 7, f.—**And let not thine heart be hasty to utter anything before God.** "Before God," *i. e.*, in the temple, in the place of the special presence of God, comp. Ps. xlii. 2; Isa. i. 12. This warning against rash, thoughtless, and unnecessary words in prayer, is as little in contradiction with apostolic directions as found in 1 Thes. v. 17; Col. iii. 17; Phil. iv. 6, as is the warning of Christ against idle words, at war with His own repeated admonitions to zealous and continuous prayer, *e. g.*, Luke xi. 5 ff.; xviii. 1, ff.; John xiv. 13; xvi. 23, *etc.*—**For God is in heaven, and thou upon the earth.** The majesty of God, in contrast with the lowliness of men, is here made clear by the contra-position of heaven and earth, as in Ps. cxv. 3, 16; Isa. lv. 7 ff.; lxvi. 1; Matt. v. 34, f.—Ver. 3. **For a dream cometh through the multitude of business; and a fool's voice is known by a multitude of words.** That is, just as a too continued, exciting, and anxious occupation of the mind (עִנְיָן) produces the phenomenon of confused and uneasy dreams, by which the sleep is disturbed, so the habit of an excess of words, causes the speech to degenerate into vain and senseless twaddle. The first clause of the verse serves solely as an illustration of the second; the comparison, as in chap. vii. 1; Prov. xvii. 3; xxvii. 21; Job v. 7, *etc.*, is effected by simply placing the sentences in juxtaposition, merely putting the copulative conjunction before the second (comp. the Int. to Proverbs, § 14 p. 32). EWALD assumes a continuous train of thought, asserting that from too much annoyance come dreams, from these, all kinds of vain and superfluous words, and, finally, from these, foolish speech; but this is decidedly opposed to the fact that הַחֲלוֹם is necessarily to be understood as a designation of the actual dream, not of a dreamy, thoughtless nature, and that the derivation of a wordy nature from the latter would be in violation of all psychological experience.

3. *First Division, second strophe.*—Vers. 4-7. Of pious conscientiousness in vowing and the fulfilment of vows. For vers. 4 and 5 see Deut. xxiii. 22-24, whose ordinances are here almost literally repeated.—**For he hath no pleasure in fools.**—כְּסִילִים are frivolous men, who are equally ready to make vows of every kind, but then delay their performance from indolence or selfishness. Of them it is said: אֵין חֵפֶץ בָּהֶם "there is no pleasure in them," namely, with God; for the context obliges us thus to finish the thought.—Ver. 5. **Better is it that thou shouldst not vow, than,** *etc.*—Comp. Deut. xxiii. 22: "But if thou shalt forbear to vow, it shall be no sin in thee;" also Acts v. 4. Ver. 6. **Suffer not thy mouth to cause thy flesh to sin.**—בָּשָׂר here marks the body as the seat of desire, therefore of sensuality and fleshly sense in general, as the New Testament *σάρξ*; chap. ii. 3 is also similar to this. The description of James, in iii. 6 f. of his Epistle, gives a clear testimony that the sensuality of man is sinfully excited by the sins of the tongue, or the mouth, and can be enkindled by the fire of evil passion; and HENGSTENBERG should not have quoted this passage as a proof of his position that "flesh" here signifies the entire personality. HITZIG translates: "Let not thy mouth bring thy body to punishment," but fails to give the proof for the possibility of the rendering of הַחֲטִיא in the sense of "bringing to punishment, atoning for."—**Neither say thou before the angel that it was an error.**—[ZÖCKLER here renders מַלְאָךְ *messenger*, to accommodate to his exegesis. —T. L.]. מַלְאָךְ, Messenger, *i. e.*, Jehovah's [Comp. Haggai i. 13; Malachi i. 3], is here the designation of the priest* or announcer and ex-

etc. It may be objected to this that such an infinitive with ל as לִשְׁמֹעַ, is not used subjectively, or very rarely. It, however, comes very much to the same thing, if we take קָרוֹב directly as an infinitive, or as used for an imperative: *be nigher to hear*, that is, more ready, more prompt (*propior facilior*) to hear, than fools are to offer sacrifice (taking כְּסִילִים as the subject of תֵּת). Or the comparative מ may depend on שְׁמֹר in the first clause, the influence of which may be regarded as extending to the second: be more careful (שְׁמֹר—מ) to hear, or to draw nigh to hear, *etc.* In such case, we get a governing word for the infinitive קָרוֹב. If it be said that it is implied or understood; that is always the case where the infinitive seems thus used for the imperative. Some familiar word of admonition, or warning, is ever implied (*look out, take care, etc.*), as sometimes in the animated language of the prophets, and as is frequently the case in Greek and Latin.—T. L.]

*[This is another case where those who maintain the late date of the book give a word an unusual sense, and then build an argument upon it. There is no reason why מַלְאָךְ should not be taken in its usual meaning, as an angel of God, visible or invisible, supposed sometimes to appear in terror, the avenging angel, as 2 Sam. xxiv. 16, who came to punish Israel and their king for his rash words. There may be an express reference here by Solomon to his father's fatal error; and the words וְאַל תֹּאמַר may be rendered very easily as a caution, *that thou mayest not have to confess thine error*, as David did (2 Sam. xxiv. 17). It must have made a deep impression on the young mind of the Prince. It is perfectly in accordance, too, with the belief and the recorded facts of the Solomonic times; and this would be the case even if we regard the מַלְאָךְ, mentioned in Ecclesiastes, as being Gad, the *messenger* sent to David. Or it may refer to the belief in the presence of angels as invisible witnesses to our sins and our improprieties—a belief belonging not only to the

Digitized by Google

pounder of the divine law; comp. Malachi ii. 7, the only passage of the O. T. where this expression is used of the priest; and see also in the N. T. Rev. i. 20; ii. 1 ff., where ἄγγελος is used essentially in the same sense. *"That it was an error"* [שְׁגָגָה as in Numb. xv. 27 ff.] is the characteristic evasion of religious superficiality and levity, which seek to excuse unfulfilled vows by declaring the neglect of them a mere error or precipitation [an unintentional error]; comp. Malachi i. 8; Matth. xv. 5, *etc.* HITZIG: "*it was a thoughtlessness,*—that is, that I made the vow at all." But a vow solemnly declared before the priest could not thus be recalled without further ceremony by declaring that it was vowed in a thoughtless manner. The thoughtless delinquent will wish to represent the evasion of its fulfilment as simply a sin of weakness or precipitation, whilst it is in reality a crime of a very serious character [comp. ELSTER and HENGSTENBERG on this passage].—**Why should God be angry at thy voice** [which thou dost misuse in a vile, sophistical and God-tempting evasion] **and destroy the work of thy hands**—that is, punish thee, therefore, by a failure of all thy undertakings, and destruction of all treasures and goods? For the warning sense of the question with לָמָּה comp. vii. 16, 17; Ps. xc. 17; 2 Chron. x. 37; Ezra iv. 22; vii. 23. Verse 7. **For in the multitude of dreams and many words there are also divers vanities.** Just as in verse 3, dreams are here also to be taken only as examples of the vanity of making many words, and of its bad consequences. As we can reasonably conclude that one who has much to do with dreams [comp. Jer. xxiii. 33; Zech. x. 1] is an unreliable man, little fitted for the duties and affairs of sober reality, therefore the wordiest babbler will inspire in us the least confidence. EWALD and HEILIGSTEDT's view: "for in too many dreams are too many vanities and words," is opposed by the connection, which shows that no information is to be imparted here concerning the nature and signification of dreams, and then also the circumstance that it is not very clearly to be seen in how far dreams may cause much useless prattle.—**But fear thou God**, so that thou dost really try to fulfill what thou hast vowed to Him. כִּי, because co-ordinate with the preceding, is to be translated by "but," and not "thus;" for it expresses in a conclusive manner the contrast to verse 6.*

4. *Second Division, first strophe*, a: vers. 8 and 9.—On avoiding injustice and violence—**If thou seest the oppression of the poor, and violent perverting of judgment and justice in a province.** Comp. iii. 16; iv. 1, ff. (Ger., robbery of judgment and justice). This is a robbery committed against these objective and divine laws, a violation of them by exactions, and other violence. Such violations of judgment are most likely to be practiced *in the provinces*, far from the seat of the king and the highest courts, by governors and generals. Therefore here בַּמְּדִינָה, by which is doubtless meant the province in which the author lives, that is, Palestine. Comp. Ez. v. 8; Neh. i. 3; vii. 6; xi. 3, and also the Int. ꝸ 4, Obs. 2.—**Marvel not at the matter.**—חֵפֶץ [Comp. iii. 1], is neither absolutely the same as "cause, matter," [HITZIG] nor does it indicate the divine pleasure, the execution of divine decrees, (as HENGSTENBERG). It is rather the violent doing of the thieving officials that is meant, the "such is my pleasure," of rulers, "who usually commence their edicts with these words: it seems good to me, it is good in presence of the king, Dan. iii. 22; vi. 2; iv. 22; Ez. v. 17." (HENGSTENBERG). For the exhortation not to marvel at such things, not to be surprised, comp. 1 Peter iv. 12: ἀγαπητοὶ μὴ ξενίζεσθε κ. τ. λ. —**For he that is higher than the highest regardeth; and there be higher than they.** That is, over the lofty oppressor stands a still higher ruler, the king; and even over him, should he not aid suffering innocence in its rights, is a still higher one, the King of kings, and Supreme Judge of the world. גְּבֹהִים is, as it were, a plural of majesty,* serving for a most

---

Old Testament, but also to the New, as appears from 1 Cor. xi. 10, διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους:" because of the angels" (invisible), indecencies in the Church were to be avoided.—T. L.]

*[Ver. 7. The simplest and most literal rendering here would seem to be the best, taking the conjunction ו, in each case, as it stands, and in the usual way. The copulative ו has, indeed sometimes an assertive force, but then the context will always clearly demand it. Here there is no need of it: "Though in multitude of dreams," or "though dreams abound, and vanities, and words innumerable, yet (כִּי) fear thou God." The first כִּי may be rendered for, and regarded as connecting, causally, this verse with what precedes, or they may both be regarded as adversative, giving the reason against, or *notwithstanding*. See explanation of כִּי Int. to Metrical Version, p 176. The word דְּבָרִים we have rendered, in the Metrical Version, presagings (idle predictions, fortune-tellings, such as go with dreams). דָּבָר is used, Numb. xxiii. 5, 16, for *oraculum.* It is the oracle given to Balaam, and though, there a divine message given to a bad man, yet there is nothing in the word itself to prevent its denoting a false, as well as a true prediction. If the view taken be correct, there must be meant, here, false or superstitious presagings, like the Greek βάξις, which is used by Aristophanes for the false predictions of the oracle-mongers, by whom Greece was infested. דָּבָר is used in the same manner, Eccles. x. 14, where the context shows that it means either pretended oracular words, or fortune-*tellings*, or some such rash sayings about the future as are condemned James iv. 13. The other rendering: "in multitude of dreams and vanities there are also words," besides having seemingly but little meaning, puts its main assertion in the first clause, and thus makes the second: "fear thou God," a merely incidental or rhetorical addition, though really the important thought: "*notwithstanding* the abounding of (all these superstitions) dreams, vanities and fortune-tellings without number, *yet* fear thou God. In the other rendering, too, besides being less simple and facile, there is lost, or obscured, the contrast evidently intended between δεισιδαιμονία, in the bad sense, or superstition, and εὐσέβεια, true religion, reverence, יִרְאַת יְהוָה, "the fear of the Lord." For an illustration see the picture of the *superstitious man* (δεισιδαίμων) as given by THEOPHRASTUS in his *Characters*, sec. 16.—T. L.]

*[The plural intensive undoubtedly exists in Hebrew, but a great deal that is said about the pluralis majestaticus is very questionable. The best Jewish commentators deny its existence. The plural גְּבֹהִים, here, may easily be taken as a sort of summing up, denoting all the powers that stand above the petty oppressor, from the earthly king, through "principalities in the Heavens" up to God Himself. Our English Version gives it well, "and there be higher than they," leaving the application indefinite. STUART regards ו as intensive: "Yea there be higher than they."—the petty oppressors. Or it may be an assertion that there is a vast series of ascending powers in the olam, or world, regarded in its rank, rather than its time or space

Digitized by Google

emphatic designation of the fulness of eternal power in the Godhead; it is the same construction as בּוֹרְאִים, "Creator," chap. xii. 1; קְדוֹשִׁים, Prov. ix. 10; xxx. 3; Hosea xii. 1. עֶלְיוֹנִים, Dan. vii. 18, 22, etc. Comp. Ewald, § 178 b. We cannot let this expression refer to the king as the highest earthly judge and potentate, on account of its analogy with other plural names of Deity. It is extremely unfitting, indeed almost absurd, to refer the second high one to a supreme judge, and the גְּבֹהִים to the governor (Hitzig). For a poor consolation would be offered to the oppressed by a reference merely to these courts, as certain as "that one crow does not pick out the eyes of another," (a very poorly sustained proverb, quoted by Hitzig himself). Ver. 9. **Moreover, the profit of the earth is for all; the king himself is served by the field.** That is, notwithstanding that God alone rules as highest judge and avenger over all the destinies of men, we are not to despise the protection and safety which an earthly authority affords, especially a strong kingly government, that can protect the fields from devastation, and their boundaries from intrusion.

בְּכֹל הִיא [so is it to be read, as in the K'tib, instead of בַּכֹּל הוּא] is of like meaning with בְּכָל זֹאת, "in all this"—or "notwithstanding all this," as it is Isa. ix. 11. The concluding words מֶלֶךְ לְשָׂדֶה נֶעֱבָד can neither mean: "a king honored by the land" (Knobel and Vaihinger), nor: "a king honored throughout the whole land" (Hahn), nor: "a king to till the field" (Luther, Starke, etc.), nor: "a king subject to the field" (Herzfeld), nor: *rex agro addictus*, (Rosenmueller, Dathe, etc.), nor: "a king to the tilled field," namely, "a profit and advantage to it," (Hitzig, Hengstenberg, comp. also the Sept.). נֶעֱבָד is here used rather in the sense of "made, installed, placed," in accordance with the Chaldaic signification of עָשָׂה—עבד, Dan. iii. 1, 15, 29; vii. 21; Ezra iv. 19, etc., and שָׂדֶה, field, is a poetical synonym of ארץ (Comp. Gen. ii. 5; iv. 7; Ruth i. 6), here undoubtedly chosen because agriculture, this principal occupation of the provinces (comp. ii. 8) can only prosper through the protection and propitious influence of the king. Compare the very close connection in which the religion of the Chinese, Persians, Egyptians, and Romans placed the royal office with agriculture. It does not militate against the view sustained by us that there is no definite article before שדה. Comp. Ewald § 277, b; and quite as little does this view disagree with the verbal collocation, as will be seen by comparing ix. 2; Isa. xlii. 24; Dan. vi. 8.*

5. *Second Division, first strophe b, and second strophe a. b:* vers. 10–17. On avoiding avarice and covetousness.—As in Deut. xvi. 19; Amos viii. 4 ff.; Prov. xv. 25–27; Sirach x. 8, so we have here the condemnation of the coarser form of covetousness, which does not shun open injustice and violence, and, directly afterwards, that of the love of money and desire of gain operating with more delicate, more genteel, and apparently more just means.—**He that loveth silver shall not be satisfied with silver,** i. e., not satisfied in mind, and consequently not happy. Comp. the Horatian line: *Semper avarus eget* (*Ep. I*, ii. 20); also Ovid *Fast. I*, 211 *S.:*

> "*Creverunt et opes et opum furiosa cupido;*
> *Et cum posideant plurima plura volunt;*"

Nor he that loveth abundance with increase. Lit., "loveth tumult;" הָמוֹן in other places, "noise, turmoil of a great multitude of people," here means, as in Ps. xxxvii. 16, the multitude of possessions; and אהב בְּ means as elsewhere חפץ בְּ.—Ver. 11. **When goods increase, they are increased that eat them.** Lit. "their eaters, their consumers." The meaning here is clearly the numerous servants of a rich household. Comp. Job i. 3; 1 Kings v. 2, ff.—**And what good is there to the owners thereof?**—כִּשְׁרוֹן here, "fortune, gain," different from ii. 21; iv. 4. The plural בעלים has here a singular meaning, as in ver. 12; vii. 11; viii. 8; Prov. iii. 27.—**Save the beholding of them with their eyes,** *i. e.*, only the empty, not really satisfying feeling of pleasure at the sight of heaped-up treasures. In place of רְאִית read רְאוּת with the Keri.—Ver. 12. **The sleep of a laboring man is sweet, whether he eat little or much;** i. e., whether he enjoys a generous food, or must be satisfied with a scanty nourishment.—עֹבֵד "laborer" is different from עֶבֶד "slave," and also from מַס עֹבֵד "serf;" it means in general every one, who according to

---

aspect. See note on Olamic Words, p. 51. The reader may imagine the gradation of ranks for himself. Of course, God is at the highest, however great it may be. This would accord with the simplest rendering of the words:

> Height over height are keeping watch,
> And higher still than they.

These vile oppressors, with all their boasts of rank, are away down in the lowest parts of the scale.—T. L.]

* [Ver. 9. The interpretations of Zöckler, Hitzig, Stuart, etc., though differing from each other, seem forced. They all destroy the parallelism, making only one proposition of what evidently contains two clauses, one an illustration of the other. Their rendering of בכל היא, as though it were equivalent to בכל זאת, Isaiah ix. 11, 20, cannot be supported. היא is a feminine used for the neuter, and may have, in such case, an antecedent masculine in form, if it expresses what is inanimate or impersonal. "The profit of the soil, in everything is it,"—like שגגה היא, "an error is it," just above. "It is in all," in everything, in every rank of life. The word נֶעֱבָד has more of a deponent than of a passive sense. In other cases, Deut. xxi. 4; Ezek. xxxvi. 9, 34, it is applied to the field that is *made use of*, *worked*, in distinction from the barren. This is the only case in which it is applied to persons, and according to the same analogy, it does not mean *served* as a master, which would be the direct passive of the Kal, but *subservient to*, or made to serve, coming near to the Kal sense, or the sense of the noun: *made useful*, or devoted to use. The connection, then, is very clear. The oppressor is reproved, not by extolling the king as the guardian of justice, and patron of agriculture, but by setting forth the value of the lowly, the cultivators of the soil, to whom the highest ranks, and, ultimately, the king himself, are *subservient*,—on whom they are dependent, and to whom they may be said, in the last resort, to owe homage. This more Republican idea, and so much more in harmony with the whole spirit of the passage, is sustained by Wordsworth. The resort to the

Digitized by Google

divine direction in Gen. iii. 19; Ex. xx. 9, must earn his bread in the sweat of his brow, be he vassal or freeman.—**But the abundance of the rich will not suffer him to sleep.** HIERONYMUS justly says: *incocto cibo in stomachi augustiis æstuante.*—הַשָּׂבָע לֶעָשִׁיר, a paraphrase for the genitive like הַצֹּפִים לְשָׁאוּל 1 Sam. xiv. 18, etc.; comp. EWALD, § 292, a.—For this sentence comp. HORACE, Sat. I., 1, 76 ss.; JUVENAL, Sat. X., 12 s.; XIV., 304; also PUBL. SYRUS: "*Avarum irritat non satiat pecunia.*"—Vers. 13–17. *Second strophe:* The annoying and inconstant nature of wealth. **There is a sore evil;** lit., "a painful evil;" חוֹלָה equivalent to the participle Neph נַחְלָה* Jer. xiv. 17; Nah. iii. 19.—**Riches kept for the owners thereof to their hurt.** Carefully guarded wealth proves a misfortune to the possessor when the latter loses this transitory and unreliable possession, and becomes, thereby, more unhappy than if he had never possessed it. The only correct illustration of this thought is afforded by ver. 14. Ver. 14. **But these riches perish by evil travail.**—עִנְיָן, lit., "annoyance, hardship," as in i. 13; iv. 8, does not here mean the unprofitable business, the unfortunate administration of the affairs of the rich, but any misfortune, an evil occurrence of the nature of those in Job i. 14–19, caused by robbers, tempests, storms, etc.†—**And he begetteth a son, and there is nothing in his hand.** וְהוֹלִיד is correctly taken as a preterit in the Sept., Vulg., and Syriac; for after the failure of his means, he who was rich leaves off begetting sons.—Ver. 15. **As he came forth of his mother's womb, naked shall he return to go as he came.**—יָשׁוּב לָלֶכֶת, lit., "he repeats his going," *i. e.*, he goes away again, namely out of this life. We find the same reflection concerning the inexorable operation of death in Job i. 21; Ps. xlix. 10; 1 Tim. vi. 7, and also in the classics, *e. g.*, PROPERT, Carm. III., 3, 35 s.:

Haud ullas portabis opes Acherontis ad undas;
Nudus ad inferna stulte, vehere rate!

Comp. P. GERHARD in the hymn: "Why should I then grieve?"

Naked lay I on the earth,
When I came, when I drew
At first my breath.
Naked shall I pass away,
When from earth again I flee,
Like a shadow.

And shall take nothing of his labor. Lit., "does he lift up through his labor;" יִשָּׂא as in Ps. xxiv. 4.—**Which he may carry away in his hand.** יֹלֵךְ is optative Hophil [=יוֹלִיךְ, Mich. iii. 4; vi. 13, etc.], and need not be changed into יֵלֵךְ, as HITZIG does in accordance with the Sept. and Symmachus. For the thought that a rich man at his death can take none of his treasures with him, is extremely fitting here, in case one does not think of the rich man described in ver. 14, who, previously to his death, was bereft of all his possessions by misfortune. And this is so much the less necessary, since before this verse death has not been considered the final end of all wealth and desire of acquiring it.—Ver. 16 emphatically repeats the thought of the preceding verse, in order to show more strongly the entire fruitlessness and folly of toiling after earthly wealth, and to prepare for the closing description in ver. 17 of the tortured existence of a rich miser.—**And this is also a sore evil,** namely, not simply that named in ver. 13, but also that added in ver. 15; consequently *not merely* the πλούτου ἀδηλότης there described (1 Tim. vi. 17), *but also death*, that places an unconditional limit to all wealth, and toiling after riches. The views of HENGSTENBERG, VAIHINGER, etc., are correct, whilst HITZIG wrongfully supposed that the second "sore evil" is not named until the last clause of this verse, and that it consists in the miserable existence of the miser, full of vexation and profitless. This "having no profit," and "laboring for the wind," coincides rather (like the contents of ver. 17) with the vanity of this world, and its inconstancy and hardship, as described in vers. 13 and 14, so that the reflection at its end again leads back to its beginning. Ver. 17. **All his days also he eateth in darkness,** that is, in a gloomy, peevish state of mind, in subjective darkness as described in Matt. vi. 23; John xi. 10. כָּל־יָמָיו can be very easily taken as the object of יֹאכֵל, although the phrase "eateth his days" does not appear again,* and therefore the meaning of "all his days" seems the more likely to be merely used as defining the time; but comp. for this view the instances at least approximately analogous in Job xxi. 13; xxxvi. 11. The Sept. seems to have read וְאֵבֶל instead of יֹאכֵל, and so in the following clause, instead of וְכָעַס they must have read וָכַעַס, and for וְחָלְיוֹ they must have read וָחֹלִי; for they translate: *καίγε πᾶσαι ἁι ἡμέραι αὐτοῦ ἐν σκότει καὶ ἐν πένθει καὶ θυμῷ*

Chaldaic signification of עֲבַר = to the Hebrew עָשָׂה, is wholly needless and unsatisfactory. If the monarchical interpretation, as we may call it, fails, then also falls to the ground what is said about the Persians, and "the king's protection of agriculture in the *provinces*," together with the inference that would then be drawn in respect to the date of the book. Such a dependence of the king upon the field is just a truth which would be perceived by the wise Solomon, but would be unheeded by a Persian monarch, or any writer who would wish to extol him. HERZFELD's interpretation is very nigh this. Our English Version, "the king is served *by* the field," or *from* the field, would require a different preposition.—T. L.]

*[See the explanation in the text note.—T. L.]

†[בְּעִנְיַן רָע may mean here the labor and travail expended in acquiring the riches. "That wealth perishes with all the labor," *etc.*, it took to get it. Such is the more literal sense of בְּ, as well as the more expressive. He has lost all his labor and travail as well as his wealth. Compare the Metrical Version.

With the sore travail [it had cost] that wealth departs.
T. L.]

*[We have the similar phrase in English—"consumeth his days"—but it is questionable whether אכל is ever thus used in Hebrew. In Job xxi. 13; xxxvi. 11, the verb is different.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

πολλῷ καὶ ἀῤῥηστίᾳ καὶ χόλῳ. Ewald and some other moderns follow it herein; but certainly with regard to the change of יאכל, at least without sufficient reason; comp. Hitzig and Elster on this passage. But nothing obliges us, in the second clause, to deviate from the Masoretic text, as Hengstenberg has correctly shown in opposition to the authors last named. For כעס as 3d, preterite, suits the adverb הרבה better than does the substantive כעס; but the closing words וחליו וקצף give an excellent sense as an independent animated exclamation: "**and he hath much sorrow and wrath with his sickness!**"* What is meant is the sickness of soul produced by the annoyance and dissatisfaction felt as against those things that oppose his striving after riches, [in substance the same as that darkness in the preceding line] a sickness which can eventually extend to his body and then torment him only the more severely.*

6. *Third Division:* vers. 18–20. Concerning a moderate and gratefully contented enjoyment of life, as the only true and wise conduct for the poor and for the rich; comp. the exactly similar closing sentence of the first discourse, chap. ii. 24–26, and also the close of the first part of the second discourse, chap. iii. 22.—**Behold that which I have seen: it is good and comely,** *etc.* Hitzig and Hahn say: "What I have found good, and what beautiful;" Hengstenberg: behold what I have seen, that it is good and handsome, *etc.* This latter translation is the only one that corresponds exactly to the accentuation,† which (by a rebia over אני) strongly separates the טוב from what precedes, but scarcely expresses the sense originally intended by the author himself. Our own view corresponds rather to this original sense, which alone is rightly in accordance with the position of אשר before יפה.—**To eat and to drink, and to enjoy the good of all his labor.** The suffix in עמלו belongs to the previously unexpressed subject of the infinitive clauses לאכל, *etc.*; comp. vii. 1; Ps. iv. 9; lxv. 9, *etc.* The eating, and drinking, and enjoying the good [lit., "seeing the good," comp. ii. 24) is as little meant in an Epicurean sense here as in similar earlier passages; it expresses simply the normal contrast to the grasping avarice previously censured.—**For it is his portion.** [כי הוא חלקו: "that it should be his portion;" כי denoting *end, purpose*, or, as it is rendered in the Metrical Version, "*to be his portion here,*"—so as not to interrupt the flow of the sentence.—T. L.] It is his lot divinely appointed unto him for this life, that he cannot take with him into the world beyond (ver. 15) and which he must consequently properly profit by here below (comp. iii. 22).—Ver. 19. **Every man also to whom God hath given riches and wealth.** Hitzig unnecessarily renders

---

*[Hitzig regards the text here as corrupt, and proposes to read בחליו and כעס. There is no serious difficulty in taking כעס as a noun [the first patach lengthened, as Jona Ben Gannach shows may be done]. The other correction, and Hitzie's charge of corruption, only show that a very acute critic, not having much imagination, may not sympathize with the poetical style, or the emotional earnestness of such a writer as Koheleth, and must therefore, often fail in interpreting him. The apparent irregularity of the sentence shows a vehement utterance, the thoughts crowding together, coming in, some of them out of their order, as though anticipated, or in danger of being forgotten. The most literal, therefore, is the rendering which is most true to this subjective emotional state: "great grief, sickness his, and wrath;" or to give it something of its rythmical order:

Yea, all his days, doth he in darkness eat;
Abundant sorrow, sickness too is his, and chafing wrath.
T. L.]

†[Those noble scholars, the Buxtorfs, and the learned as well as devout Boston, were not altogether without reason in their belief that the Hebrew system of accents, as found in our Hebrew Bibles, partook, in some degree, of the Biblical inspiration. There is a critical acuteness, a spiritual-mindedness, we may say, manifested by those early accentuators from whom came the traditional masora, that is truly wonderful. There are many examples in the Psalms. There is an instance of it, we think, in this passage, vers. 18 and 19. They have placed a rebia, a disjunctive accent, over אני ver. 18, thereby separating it from טוב that follows. This our English translators have observed, as also Hahn, Hengstenberg and others, who, after all, do not make the right use of it. Zöckler acknowledging though disregarding the accents, renders: "behold what I have seen as good, that it is fair to eat," *etc.*,—making אשר a conjunction. To follow the accentuation, however, is the only way to bring out the sense in all its force and clearness. The other method makes טוב and יפה synonymous, and represents eating and drinking as the good *per se*, without qualification; the assertion afterwards made, about its being the gift of God, having no effect in changing, or modifying this positive declaration. On the contrary, the accentual rendering, makes the *perception* and the consciousness of this [הטוב לראות טוב], the very thing that constitutes the "good which is fair" [טוב אשר יפה], in distinction from the mere *pleasure* which the Epicurean would call good. Thus it reads, according to the accents: "good that is fair, to eat and drink, *etc.* (that is, in eating and drinking), and to *see* the good," *etc.*,—intimating that there is a good, or seeming good, that is not *fair*, or beautiful. a טוב that is not יפה. To take אשר thus as a relative pronoun, is the only way to avoid a tautology; for the other rendering makes no distinction between טוב and יפה, or rather regards the one as but a repetition of the other. It is true that, in such use of אשר, the personal pronoun generally follows [טוב אשר יפה הוא] but not always, as Gen. vii. 8, העוף וכל אשר רמש, and similar cases, especially Hosea xii. 8, "they shall not find in me, עון אשר חטא, iniquity that is sin,"—meaning by חטא a qualification of the general term עון, or a known and wilful sin, one deserving of punishment, as both Kimchi and Aben Ezra explain it. Grammatically and logically it is precisely similar to this case. It is not easy to resist the conclusion that a logical differentia, some qualifying of טוב, was here intended. It is, in fact, that same distinction which is made by the ordinary mind, if devout, and which we find in Plato, the mystical, as some style him, but who is, in reality, the clearest, and, in the truest sense of the term, the most common-sense of all the philosophers. It is the ἀγαθὸν that is καλὸν (since the sensualist also has his ἀγαθόν, so called, which is not καλὸν, but only ἡδὺ) the βέλτιστον, or to use similar language of Cicero, the *bonum* that is *pulchrum*, the *dulce* that is *honestum*. It is the word used chap. iii. 11 to denote the *beauty* of everything in its season, as God made it, את־הכל עשה יפה בעתו, or as the world was pronounced all *good*, all *fair*, at creation, whilst still in unison with the

Digitized by Google

אשר נתן לו "that God gives him," (or "if") *etc.* The anakolouthon between the nominative absolute "every man" and the final clause: "that is the gift of God," cannot be thus removed.—**And hath given him power to eat thereof,** *etc.* For השליט "to cause to rule, to empower any one," comp. Ps. cxix. 133; Dan. ii. 28, 48. That is the gift of God. The emphasis does not rest on אלהים, as in the similar thought in chap. ii. 24, but on מתת, which here therefore means a noble gift (δόσις ἀγαθή, δώρημα τέλειον, Jas. i. 17) a gracious present, as the following verse teaches. Comp. also HORACE, Epis. I., 4, 6:

Di tibi divitias dederunt, artemque fruendi.

Ver. 20. **For he shall not much remember the days of his life.** That is not as EWALD says: "Memory and enjoyment of this life do not last long," which would clearly give a totally foreign thought, but he now forgets all toil and vexation of his former life,* and learns, in consequence of the divine beneficence which he gratefully and contentedly enjoys, to forget the "miserable life" (LUTHER) that he previously led, and cares no more concerning the rapid flight and short duration of his earthly days, (comp. vi. 12). **Because God answereth him in the joy of his heart.** The second כִּי is subjoined to the first one in the commencement of the clause, and is therefore better translated with "because" or "since" than with "for." מַעֲנֶה בְּ lit. "he answers him with," *i. e.*, he hears him by vouchsafing, *etc.;* for this signification of the Hiph, of ענה comp. 1 Kings viii. 35; 2 Chron. vi. 26; Hos. ii. 23. All other meanings are contrary to the language and connection, *e. g.* HITZIG: "he makes him ready to serve;" KÖSTER: "he makes him sing with the joy of his heart;" VAIHINGER (according to the Sept. and Vulg.): "he occupies him with the joy of his heart," *etc.*

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

(*With Homiletical Hints.*)

The threefold means given in this chapter for obtaining and advancing earthly happiness, are the fulfilment of duty towards God, our neighbors, and ourselves; or the three virtues corresponding to these three kinds of duties—εὐσέβεια, δικαιοσύνη and σωφροσύνη (Tit. ii. 12: Matth. xxii. 37-39). Among the duties to God, special attention is directed to proper demeanor in regard to prayer and vows; among the duties to our neighbor, the avoiding of injustice and covetousness, and as duties to ourselves, temperance and serene cheerfulness in the enjoyment of the pleasures of this life. Each of these special directions regarding moral demeanor is so presented that its relation to the happiness and peace of men's souls clearly appears. And thus, especially, in the sphere of religious duties, the necessity of pure truthfulness, sacred earnestness, and careful bridling of the tongue (in prayer as in vows), or, in a word, the just fear of God is insisted on as the essence of all those conditions on which depends the preservation of the Divine favor (ver. 4), and thus the foundation of all internal and external happiness. In the obligations of justice and unselfishness towards our neighbor (vers. 8-17) special reference is

---

divine name and presence. The טוב that is יָפֶה, the GOOD that is FAIR, must have some other element in it than mere sense-enjoyment, or *voluptas* (*velle quod optat*). This appears by another accentual mark. The same acute critics have placed a zakeph gadhol, another strong disjunctive accent, upon the demonstrative pronoun הוּ in ver. 19, thereby making it more emphatic, by separating it from the adjoining words, thus constituting it a clause by itself, as it were, to which special attention is called. By being thus separated from what is near, it goes back to the טוב mentioned some ways above or to the idea contained, and carries it through all the clauses: "*good* that is *fair*, to eat and drink, and *see the good*," *etc.*, (through all that follows in the long recital) "*this*"—*this* (good) I say—is God's own gift." The meaning is, that the recognition and the consciousness of this are necessary to make it *good*, or *the good* emphatically—"the *good* that is *fair*"—and that, without this it would not be יָפֶה, καλόν, *honestum*, *etc.*, but sheer sensualism, which in itself, he so often pronounces worthlessness and vanity. The whole passage, 18–20, has the air of a solemn recapitulation, in which the writer means to express his deepest and truest feeling: "And now, behold what I have seen: *good* that is *fair*," *etc.*; all such good is from above, and there is really no other that deserves to be so called. It is imbued throughout with the name of God, as though His name were inseparable from any true idea of the *good*. Taking the accents in their intended form, the passage has a most eloquent fulness; disregarding them, we have sheer Epicureanism, expressed in what seems a verbose style, tautological, unmeaning, and, withal, out of harmony with the general scope of the book. The earnestness of the writer in his desire of fully setting out the thought, is shown by the repetition in the beginning of the 19th verse: גם כל האדם, "yea every man, as God has given him wealth, and power to eat thereof, and bear his portion," *etc.*, and then the strong accented הוּ making the peroration of the whole; so that the Epicurean or sensualist could claim no fragment of it as, in the least, favoring the godless philosophy. See the Metrical Version. It is all idle to put the most naked Epicureanism in the mouth of the writer, as ZÖCKLER and STUART do, and then deny it is such, or attempt to weave for it some possible evangelical robe.—T. L.]

*[EWALD's view is to be preferred, though with a modification. In the recognition of the higher *good* (see marginal note, p. 94), or the gift and blessing of God, the mere sensual pleasure, the mere *living*, as an enjoyment, is not much remembered, nor the time it lasts. The higher aspect makes the lower seem less, though not undervalued.

Not life itself, with all its joys,
Could my best passions move,
Or raise so high my cheerful voice,
As Thine endearing love.

Compare it with Psalm iv. 5: "*Thou* hast put joy in my heart more than [the joy of] the time [מֵעֵת], when their corn and their wine increase:" and especially with the verse preceding (Ps. iv. 7) "Many are saying" (it is the great inquiry among men) "who will show us good" (*the good*, the *summum bonum*, the טוב אשר יָפֶה, the good that is beautiful), and then how full of light, and power, and meaning, is the answer: "Lift Thou upon us the light of Thy countenance, Jehovah." That was the good which philosophy, whether Epicurean or Stoical, could never find: "*The Light of Thy countenance*," or of Thy *presence!* We have become so familiar with this precious Hebraism, that we lose sight of its glorious beauty. In what other language, or literature, can we find anything like it? With the sentiment of Koheleth that it is the thought of God's grace that makes the good, compare also the language, Ps. xxx. 5: "In His favor *is life*," and Ps. lxiii. 4: "Thy loving-kindness is better than life"—טוב חַסְדְּךָ מֵחַיִּים—a good that is more than life. It is the same idea, though the language of Koheleth is more calm, more philosophic, we may say, than the impassioned diction of the Psalmist, made more striking and emotional by the use of the second person.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

made to the certainty of judicial visitation on the part of God or the King (vers. 8 and 9), to the freedom from stinging avarice and torturing care (ver. 10 to 17), and to the superiority of heavenly treasures, which one is not obliged to leave here and sacrifice at death, as is the case with earthly treasures (vers. 13-16); and these are represented as just so many sources of real inward happiness and peace. With regard to the serenity of life recommended at the close as a means of properly fulfilling the duties to one's self (vers. 18-20), sensual enjoyment in itself is not so much praised as a principal means of happiness, as is the grateful consciousness that all joys and blessings of this life come from God, together with the diligence and zealous activity in vocation that truly give flavor to the enjoyment of these pleasures ("to enjoy the good of all his labor," ver. 18; "to rejoice in his labor," ver. 19); and just in this manner is demonstrated the way of acquiring genuine and lasting happiness, in contradistinction to Epicureanism and all that philosophy which declares pleasure to be the chief good. In a comprehensive homiletical treatment of the section, the theme might be presented as follows: "Of a godly, just, and chaste life in this world, as the foundation of all genuine happiness in this world and the next;" or: "Of a right truthfulness, in prayer before God, in administration of earthly goods before men, and in the wise enjoyment of the pleasures of life in presence of one's own conscience;" or also (with special reference to contents of verses 8 and 9): "Honor all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honor the king" (1 Pet. ii. 17).

HOMILETICAL HINTS ON SEPARATE PASSAGES.

Chap. v. 1. HIERONYMUS: *Non ingredi domum Dei, sed sine offensione ingredi, laudis est.*

MELANCTHON:—Solomon declares that the principal and best worship of God is to listen to His word and faithfully follow it. But it has always been the case that men have invented a multitude of sacrifices, and various ceremonies; thus the heathen, the Pharisees and the monks have falsified the proper way of reverencing God. This audacity of man is here condemned as a deep sin, however much its originators may defend it and praise their superstition as a glorious virtue.

STARKE:—We must visit the church as creatures who humble themselves before their Creator, as subjects doing homage to their Lord, as paupers begging for spiritual gifts, as sick men imploring aid, as Christians ready to serve Him with willing and pure heart.

BERLEBURG BIBLE:—One must not be satisfied with simple hearing, else it is this and nothing else, and this was not meant. The outward is simply outward; the true object of external worship must only be to lead to the internal.

Chap. v. 2, 3. BRENZ:—Because God alone dwells in heaven, *i. e.*, is alone true, wise and just, and we live on the earth, and are, therefore, liars, fools, and sinners, it in no manner becomes us with our human wisdom, which in God's eyes is folly, to judge of divine and heavenly things, and to indulge in many words with God concerning our worldly affairs, experiences and knowledge. But we must listen to God; leave to Him every decision, and silently obey His word as the only true wisdom.

GEIER:—Think at all times in thy prayer of the majesty of God with whom thou speakest, and of thine own unworthiness, this will then strongly move thy heart in pious devotion.

BERLEB. BIBLE:—"Let thy words be few;"—how far-reaching is this precept, in teaching, in preaching, in prayer, and in ordinary life! How many a long sermon would be condemned by this censorship, although it might fulfil all the requirements of the preacher's art! And how few spiritual things would be found in many discourses, if they were purified of all useless, unedifying, vain, annoying, and improper words, as they indeed should be!—The Saviour has regarded this counsel, and hence has given a very short formula of prayer, in the very beginning of which He impresses on the suppliant the majesty of God who is in heaven, but tempers it with the loving name of father, *etc.*

Vers. 4-7. BRENZ:—Vows, which proceed from unbelief, or violate the precepts of brotherly love, the Christian should neither make nor fulfil if he has made them. But if the vow proceeds from faith and love, and accords with their commands, then it must be kept: else God will judge thee as the fool, *i. e.*, as the ungodly.

LANGE:—Dear man, seek to maintain thy baptismal vows, therein hast thou vows enough.

HANSEN (ver. 6):—The mouth causeth the flesh to sin when it promises what the flesh neither can nor will perform.

STARKE (ver. 7):—The fear of the Lord is the essence of all true virtue, and it also teaches how one should wisely use his tongue (James i. 26).

HENGSTENBERG:—He who really fears God will say nothing concerning Him but that which proceeds from his inmost heart, and vow nothing but that which he is resolved inviolably to keep.

Vers. 8 and 9. LUTHER:—This book teaches thee to give thy heart to rest, and not to fret and pine too much when things go wrong, but, when the devil engages in malice, violence, injustice and oppression of the poor, to be able to say: "this is the course of the world; God will judge and avenge it." Let each one, therefore, in his sphere do his work with best diligence, according to the command of God: the rest he may commit to God and suffer. Let him await then what the godless and unjust men may do!—

The stone thou canst not lift, let lie;
Thy strength upon some other try.

MELANCTHON (ver. 8):—Observe here the difference between a king and a tyrant. A tyrant devastates and destroys; a good ruler cherishes his country, protects and furthers the interests of agriculture, the prosperity of the Church, the arts and industries, and all good things.

STARKE:—God is the ruler of all nations (Ps. lxxxii. 8). The loftiest noble and the meanest peasant must alike humbly acknowledge Him as his Lord, and reverence and obey Him.

WOHLFARTH:—What Solomon says we see yet

Digitized by Google

to-day. Although Church and State make every effort to advance the cause of righteousness and retard that of sin, the realm of evil is nevertheless wide-spread, and covetousness, pride, envy, deceit, voluptuousness, every where raise in oppression their repulsive heads. But let us remember that the earth is ever a land of imperfection; then this will not surprise us; but we shall rather be inclined to find in the contrast in which the reality stands with the belief in Divine justice, a reason for our hope of immortality and final reward, and, while we seek according to our strength to prevent evil, we will ourselves shun every sin, that we may hereafter stand rejoicing before God's throne.

Ver. 10 ff. LUTHER:—What is a miser but a poor, tortured, uneasy soul and heart, that is always looking after that which it does not possess; it is therefore vanity and wretchedness. Are not those happy people who are satisfied with the present favors of God, and comfortable nourishment for the body, and who leave it to God to care for the future?—If now God gives thee riches, use thy share as thou usest thy share of water, and let the rest flow by thee; if thou dost not do so, thy gathering will be all in vain.

GEIER:—The best inheritance that a rich man can leave to his children is Christian instruction in the discipline and admonition of the Lord, and thorough education in the arts and sciences.

ZELTNER:—How happy are hearts that are heavenly inclined, that are contented with what the beneficent hand of God has bestowed on them, and enjoy it with His blessing in gratitude.

WOHLFARTH:—How foolishly do those act who live solely for their earthly existence.

Vers. 18-20. LUTHER:—To "eat in darkness" is nought else than to pass one's life in melancholy. All avaricious and troublesome people find something that does not please them, where they can fret and scold. For they are full of care, vexation, and anxiety; they cannot joyfully eat, nor joyfully drink, but always find something that annoys and offends them.

LANGE:—A true Christian uses the nourishment and needful supplies of his body, to the especial end that he may recognize the goodness of God in all his labor under the sun.

HANSEN:—In order to enjoy the good that there is in the riches of this world, it is necessary that one have a perfect rule over them, *i. e.*, that in the use of them he may at all times act in accordance with the Divine purpose, Ps. lxii. 10.

BERLEB. BIBLE:—As "to the pure every thing is pure" (Tit. i. 15), so also wealth may be used by such a one in purity, and it will therefore depend mainly on each one's own heart how it stands in the presence of God. But if one does not remain contented and quiet when house and home burn up, or some other injury happens to his possessions, then is he not yet rightly placid and tranquil; this is the proof of it.

THIRD DISCOURSE.

Of true practical Wisdom.

CHAP. VI. 1—VIII. 15.

A. It cannot consist in striving after earthly sources of happiness.

CHAP. VI. 1-12.

1. Even those most richly blessed with earthly possessions do not attain to a true and lasting enjoyment of them.

(VERS. 1-6.)

1 There is an evil which I have seen under the sun, and it *is* common among men:
2 A man to whom God hath given riches, wealth, and honor, so that he wanteth nothing for his soul of all that he desireth, yet God giveth him not power to eat
3 thereof, but a stranger eateth it: this *is* vanity, and it *is* an evil disease. If a man beget an hundred *children*, and live many years, so that the days of his years be many, and his soul be not filled with good, and also *that* he have no burial; I say,
4 *that* an untimely birth *is* better than he. For he cometh in with vanity, and de-
5 parteth in darkness, and his name shall be covered with darkness. Moreover he hath not seen the sun, nor known *any thing:* this hath more rest than the other.
6 Yea, though he live a thousand years twice *told*, yet hath he seen no good: do not all go to one place?

Digitized by Google

2. He who strives most zealously after earthly happiness, never gets beyond the feeling of the vanity of all earthly things, and the hope of a totally obscure future.

(Vers. 7-12.)

7 All the labour of man *is* for his mouth, and yet the appetite is not filled.
8 For what hath the wise more than the fool? what hath the poor, that knoweth to
9 walk before the living? Better *is* the sight of the eyes than the wandering of the
10 desire: this *is* also vanity and vexation of spirit. That which hath been is named
already, and it is known that it *is* man: neither may he contend with him that is
11 mightier than he. Seeing there be many things that increase vanity, what *is* man
12 the better? For who knoweth what *is* good for man in *this* life, all the days of his
vain life which he spendeth as a shadow? for who can tell a man what shall be
after him under the sun?

[Ver. 3. הַנֵּפֶל (נֵפֶל) this peculiar word occurs Job iii. 16, Ps. lviii. 9, as well as here; in all which places it has the same meaning of premature birth, or abortion. It comes from the Hiphil sense of the verb as used in such places as Isaiah xxvi. 29, where it is applied to the earth as giving birth. For a similar use of the Greek πίπτω, compare HOMER, *Iliad*, xix. 110.—T. L.]

[Ver. 4. כִּי; See Remarks in Introduction to Metrical Version, p. 177.—T. L.]

[Ver. 6. אִלּוּ said to be a particle *Sequioris Hebraismi* (See GESENIUS) but it is only a matter of pronunciation. It is only what אִם לוּ would be in sound if written in full—the מ in such cases, where the words are pronounced rapidly together, being elided in sound. This belongs to the Hebrew, as well as to the Syriac and Arabic, and its appearance or non-appearance in writing is only a peculiarity of orthography which is not determinative of date, any more than the abbreviations of אֲשֶׁר which are found in the ancient as well as in the later Hebrew writings. It would easily come from a copyist following the sound.—T. L.]

[Ver. 10. אָדָם, the point intended here requires that this should be rendered as the proper name. The reference is to the *naming*, Gen. ii. 7.—T. L.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

This section contains firstly the negative of the illustration relative to the nature of true wisdom, which forms the contents of the third discourse, or a censure of the vain and perverse efforts of those who seek that wisdom in the way of external and earthly happiness. In two clearly marked sections or strophes of equal length, the author first shows that all worldly blessings are of no avail to him who is not able to enjoy them (vers. 1-6) and then that this very incapability of enjoyment depends partly on the perception of the vanity of earthly things, and partly on the necessity, affecting all men, of depending on a totally dark and uncertain future, while dissatisfied with the present (vers. 7-12). The latter of these two sections (especially in its second half, vers. 10-12) reminds us of previous reflections, as i. 2-11; iii. 1-9; and partially also of v. 12-16. But that the last named passage reappears in its principal thoughts in the present place, is an unjustified assertion of some commentators (also of VAIHINGER, p. 34). For, as HITZIG properly observes, there the rich man loses his blessings without having enjoyed them; here, on the contrary, he retains them.—EWALD, ELSTER, HAHN, and some others, begin a new leading section with ver. 10 of this chapter (EWALD, indeed, a new discourse, which he extends from vi. 10; viii. 15). But since vers. 10-12 clearly belong to the description of the vanity of earthly happiness commenced in ver. 1, whilst the admonition to walk in the ways of true wisdom does not commence until chap. vii. 1, *etc.*, our division, which corresponds with the division of the chapters, is to be preferred.

2. *First strophe.* Vers. 1-6. The unhappiness of not being able to enjoy present earthly blessings. **There is an evil which I have seen under the sun.** In words similar to chap. x. 5; and in like manner to chap. v. 13.—**And is common among men.** (ZÖCKLER's translation, and it bears heavily on man). Literally: "And is a great thing on man." רַבָּה cannot here have been intended to show the frequency of the evil (LUTHER, "and is common among men;" Vulg. "*malum frequens*"), but only its extent and weight, as is shown by the expression רָעָה רַבָּה in the parallel passages ii. 21; and viii. 6.—Ver. 2. **A man to whom God hath given riches, wealth, and honor.** The same triad of sensual goods: 2 Chron. i. 11; comp. similar combinations in Prov. iii. 16; viii. 18; xxii. 4. HENGSTENBERG is arbitrary in the assertion, that by the rich man is meant the *Persian*, and by the "stranger," named immediately afterwards, the successor of the Persian in the dominion of the world. This discourse is much too general in its character to permit us to seek in it such special historical and political allusions. For the doubtful propriety of affirming such political allusions in this book, see *Introduction*, § 4, *Obs.* 3.—**So that he wanteth nothing for his soul of all that he desireth.** (ZÖCKLER, "of any thing"). This is clearly the meaning of וְאֵינֶנּוּ חָסֵר לְנַפְשׁוֹ מִכֹּל as is shown partly by the suffix in אֵינֶנּוּ, and partly also by the construction of חָסֵר with מִן occurring in chap. iv. 8. Therefore not: "he wanteth for his soul nothing of all" (*Vulg.*, DRUSIUS, BAUER, *etc.*), but "of any thing." The Septuagint is more correct, *καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ὑστερῶν τῇ ψυχῇ*

Digitized by Google

αὐτοῦ, also LUTHER and nearly all the modern commentators.—**Yet God giveth him not power to eat thereof.** This incapacity of enjoyment can proceed from the sickness of the wealthy possessor, or from the burden of heavy cares which rob him of his sleep (comp. v. 12), or from a soul made gloomy by melancholy or dejection (comp. v. 17). The author can only mean such an inability to enjoy blessings as is connected with a steady continuance of their possession, as more clearly appears in vers. 8 and 6; consequently not an inability caused by the deprivation of them, by some other misfortune, or by early death, as EWALD and VAIHINGER suppose. For הִשְׁלִיט, to empower, to enable, *i. e.*, "to allow or grant," comp. v. 19. God must grant us the possession of goods, and also the power to enjoy them—the same God who in an ethical sphere provides all in all, the *Posse*, the *Velle*, and the *Perficere*.—**But a stranger eateth it**—*i. e.*, not some robber of his goods, (EWALD, VAIHINGER) or the successor of the Persian in the rule of the world (HENGSTENBERG), but the reckless heir * of the rich man, who, during the lifetime of the latter, and when he is tortured by disease, sorrow, or foolish avarice, already begins to riot and revel with his goods, and after his death will exhaust them in feasting and merry-making. (Comp. ii. 18).—**This is vanity, and it is an evil disease.** "Evil disease" is an expression originating perhaps in Deut. xxviii. 59, which here signifies an evil resembling a very malignant disease. The word חֳלִי, however, has no sort of etymological connection with cholera (χολέρα from χολή, gall). Ver. 3. **If a man beget a hundred children.** For the high appreciation, in the old covenant, of the blessing of many children, comp. Gen. xxiv. 60; Ps. cxxvii. 3-5; Job xxvii. 14; and for the value attached to long life, Ex. xx. 12; Deut. xi. 9, 21; Ps. xlix. 9.—**And live many years, so that the days of his years be many.** Herein is meant the sum of all the days of which all his years consist (Ps. xc. 10.) To the first clause, "and live many years," is added the latter equivalent one, as explanatory and emphatic, without producing an absolute tautology.—**And also that he have no burial**, that is, an honorable burial, that testifies of the real love of his posterity, and therefore truly deserves the name of "burial." The opposite of such an honorable burial is that found in Isa. liii. 9.—"He made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death;" or in Jer. xxii. 19.—"He shall be buried with the burial of an ass;" or in the neglect of burial and the lying on the face of the earth like dung (Jer. viii. 2; ix. 21; xxv. 33; Isa. xiv. 19, 20; Ps. lxxix. 3). The cause of such dishonorable קְבוּרָה, which is not truly קְבוּרָה we are clearly to find in the absence of filial piety and esteem on the part of the posterity of the avaricious rich man, and not in the sordid meanness of the latter himself, who "*ex turpi tenacitate non audeat aliquid honestæ sepulturæ destinare*" (SCHMIDT, RAMB., and VAIHINGER). HENGSTENBERG unnecessarily assumes for קְבוּרָה the signification of "grave, tomb," a meaning elsewhere quite common. As in this passage, so also does the context in Jer. xxii. 19 rather demand the sense of *exequiæ, funus*. HITZIG's position that the words: "and also that he have no burial," is simply a note originally written on the margin of verse 5, is pure caprice.—**I say that an untimely birth is better than he**;—because such a birth has enjoyed no pleasure in this life, but has also experienced no suffering; comp. iv. 2 f., and especially Job iii. 16. Verses 4 and 5 continue the comparison of the untimely birth.—**For * he cometh in with vanity**, *i. e.*, falls into nothingness from his mother's womb. **And his name shall be covered with darkness**, *i. e.*, he receives no name, "but is given over to absolute oblivion." (ELSTER). **Moreover he hath not seen the sun**;—this sun which shines brightly and lovingly, but also shines on a great deal of vanity and vexation, of woe and misery; wherefore it may be considered a good fortune not to have seen it. **This hath more rest than the other.** "Rest," *i.e.*, freedom from the annoyances, toils, and troubles of this life. We are certainly not to think with HITZIG of that passive, dreamy rest so desired by the Orientals.† For the use of the comparative מִן here, comp. Ps. lii. 8; Hab. ii. 16. Ver. 6. **Yea, though he live a thousand years twice told**; therefore twice as long as the life of the oldest patriarchs from Adam to Noah. HIERONYMUS is correct in saying: "*et non ut Adam prope mille, sed duobus millibus vixerit annis*," "Not lived, as Adam, near a thousand, but two thousand years,"—**Yet hath he seen no good.** Comp. ii. 24; iii. 12, etc. **Do not all go to one place?** namely, to Scheol, in which all arrive equally poor, and where we cannot regain what we have failed to enjoy on earth; comp. ix. 10; xi. 8. As an extension to the principal clause, this question might be introduced with the expression: "I ask then."

3. *Second strophe.* Vers. 7—12. The cause of this inability to enjoy earthly blessings, consists

*[The phrase אִישׁ נָכְרִי, "a stranger man," cannot possibly mean here an heir, or one of kin, either near or remote. Besides the context, and especially the mention of his having no funeral, shows an utter dispossession, in whatever way it may be supposed to have taken place. He, and his hundred sons, are all reduced to poverty, and there is none to do him the honor of such a funeral as his estate might have demanded. This is the soreness of it.—T. L.]

*[It should be rendered "*though it* cometh in with vanity," *etc.* See the remarks on כִּי, as denoting a reason *notwithstanding*, as well as a reason *for*, Introd. to Metrical Version p. 177. The rendering *for* completely changes the sense, and makes the reader think of the rich man, until the context forces to the other conception. The same effect is produced in our E. V. by the rendering *he* instead of *it*, which is more properly applicable to the *abortion*, conceived of as impersonal. See Met. Ver.—T. L.]

†[The word נַחַת does not primarily mean *rest, repose*, in either sense, but simply a *lying down*. It refers to the state or condition taken as a whole. So מְנוּחָה, from the same root, means a place of rest, rather than rest itself, as in Ps. xxiii. 2, מֵי מְנוּחוֹת means not "the *still* waters," but the streams by which the sheep lie down to rest. It does not refer to the *quality* of rest, much less to its *quantity* as our E. V. would make it: "More rest than the other;" but is simply an affirming that the state or condition, on the whole, of the *vainly born* is better, more desirable, than that of the man who *vainly lived*. The one is better off than the other.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

in the vanity of the present and the uncertainty of the future conditions of the happiness of men. **All the labor of man is for his mouth, and yet the appetite is not filled.**—(Zöckler, "the soul.") That is, all human life is a grasping after enjoyment, but after an enjoyment vain in itself, and affording no true satisfaction. "Mouth and soul" stand in contrast to each other as representatives of the purely sensual and therefore transitory enjoyment (comp. Job xii. 11; Prov. xvi. 26) as compared with the deeper, more spiritual, and, therefore, more lasting kind of joy. The clear sense of this verse, in essential harmony with chap. i. 8, is, that the necessity of the inner man for a more substantial and lasting enjoyment is not satisfied by pleasures of that kind, namely, by eating and drinking (ii. 24; iii. 13; v. 18; viii. 15); and therefore נֶפֶשׁ here cannot be translated by "desire, sensual desire;" and this same remark applies to ver. 2, or ver. 9, notwithstanding the opposite view of Hitzig, Vaihinger, Elster, etc. Luther's translation is also unfitting; he gives "heart," but his entire conception of the verse is grammatically inaccurate: "Labor is appointed to every man according to his strength, but the heart cannot abide by it." Ver. 8. **For what hath the wise more than the fool?** That is, one may strive after the more earnest and real, instead of the mere sensual pleasure, and thus, by a desire for food for his soul, show himself a wise man in contrast with the fool who seeks only to satisfy his mouth: but the former has no real advantage over the latter, since neither attains to the desired "satisfaction of the soul." This sentence clearly holds a confirming relation to the preceding, and not an opposing one, as Elster holds; he translates כִּי by "nevertheless," as does Hitzig, who regards this verse as opposing the contents of the verse preceding. Hengstenberg affirms an extravagant comparison between the wise man and the fool, when he supposes that both are here equally accused of avarice. On the contrary, a distinction is here clearly drawn between the desire of the fool, aiming at possession and enjoyment, and the more thoughtful, more self-possessed, more honorable and worthy conduct of the wise man.* The latter is indicated in the second clause by the words: **The poor that knoweth to walk before the living.** Here the word poor (עָנִי humble) shows the moral condition and demeanor of the wise man, by virtue of which, with a more just conception of himself as an humble "quiet one in the land," he leads a modest and retired life (comp. Ps. x. 2; xxxiv. 6; xxxvii. 2; Zech. ix. 9, *etc.*); but "**knowing to walk before the living,**" is understanding the correct rule of life, and the true and godly intercourse with one's fellow-men, and is, therefore a circumlocution to express the idea of "wise" in the solemn Old Testament sense. Ewald, following the masoretic accentuation (which is here not authoritative), separates יוֹדֵעַ (knowing) from the following infinitive clause, and regards this as the subject: "What profits it to the patient man, to the understanding man to walk before the living (*i. e.*, to live)?" But the adjective conception of יוֹדֵעַ, "*knowing, intelligent,*" is neither sustained by Prov. xvii. 27, nor Eccles. ix. 11, and the parallel passages iv. 13, 17, and many others, support the direct connection with the following word לַהֲלֹךְ. The explanations of Luther are ungrammatical. "Why does the poor man dare to be among the living?" and the Vulg. "*Et quid pauper, nisi ut pergat illuc, ubi est vita?*" Ver. 9. **Better is the sight of the eyes than the wandering of the desire,** (Zöckler, "of the soul"). That is, because the wise man with his strivings after higher aims, has nothing better than the pleasure-seeking fool, therefore a contented enjoyment of the present is the most desirable, more to be desired than a restless striving without satisfaction, or than the wearying one's self with manifold designs with no hope of their success. The "sight of the eyes" is here, as in ver. 11, 7, the pleasant enjoyment of that which is before the eyes, or of the good and the beautiful which are present. (See Luther on this passage, in the Homiletical Hints). The wandering of the soul (not of the desire, see ver. 7), is the uneasy scheming of the man dissatisfied with his modest lot, the passionate μετεωρίζεσθαι (Luke xii. 29) or the φρόνειν τὰ ὑψηλά (Rom. xii. 16), consequently the same as the expression: "His soul shall not be filled" in vers. 3 and 7, only marking more clearly than this the self-caused guilt of the want of spiritual contentment. This sentence has many parallels among the classic authors; *e.g.*, Horace, 4 *Ep.* I. 18, 96 ss:

Inter cuncta leges, et percontabere doctos,
Qua ratione queas traducere leniter ævum,
Ne te semper inops agitet vexetque cupido,
Ne pavor et rerum mediocriter utilium spes.

Comp. *Marcus Aurelius III.*, 16; *IV.*, 26; *Juvenal. Sat. XIV.*, 178; *Lucian, Necromant. I.*, 194, *etc.*—**This is also vanity and vexation of spirit**; namely this maxim: "Better is the sight of the eyes," *etc.*, and a life and conduct in accordance with it. A partial reference of גַּם־זֶה to the "wandering of the soul" (Luther and Hengstenberg) corresponds quite as little to the sense as the extension of the thought to everything from ver. 7 onward [Vaihinger and Elster]. Comp. the case precisely similar to this in chap. ii. 26. Ver. 10. **That which hath been is named already.** This remark, reminding us of chap. i. 9 f., proves the author's way for the description of the total uncertainty and obscurity of the future of man, in so far as it points to his banishment into the fixed circle of all creature life and action. "That which hath been is named already," *i. e.*, it has already

*[Stuart's view here is worthy of consideration. "It is the כִּי apodictic," he says, "*i. e.*, such as is employed in sentences of this nature: If—so and so; *then* (כִּי) this or that consequence." He takes it as an objector's language, or the author personifying an objector, thus: "*The appetite is not satisfied:—then* (asks the inquirer) how do the wise have any advantage, *etc.?*" Stuart says "the question is not answered here;" but it may be regarded as having a suggested if not a direct response in the verse following: *better the sight of the eyes*, that is, the contented enjoyment of the wise, than the fool's ever roving desire. This is the view adopted and expressed in the Metrical Version.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

been, in the past, something in its nature manifest and well-known. The exclusive reference of the clause to man, by means of which Gen. v. 2; Ps. cxxxix. 16, *etc.*, would become parallels of this passage, is forbidden by the neuter מָה. The discourse does not make special reference to man until we reach the following clause. **And it is known that it is man,** [ZÖCKLER, "the man"]. Here EWALD and ELSTER are correct; it is not "that he is a man" (KNOBEL, VAIHINGER, HENGSTENBERG) or, "what the man is" (ROSENMUELLER), or, "who the man is" (HAHN), or finally, "that if one is a man he cannot contend," *etc.*, (HITZIG),—these are all conceptions that militate against the connection, and do not correspond to the simple expression אֲשֶׁר־הוּא אָדָם.* **Neither may he contend with him that is mightier than he.** That is with God, namely, with Him who is תַּקִּיף or שַׁדַּי [Job v. 17; Ruth i. 20, 21, *etc.*], who is superior to man just because He is mightier than man [הַתַּקִּיף מִמֶּנּוּ] or because He has ordained the whole circle of human existence with absolute creative power, so that man may neither contend with Him nor break through the limit to which he is assigned. For the word דִּין, "to contend with any one," compare נָדוֹן 2 Sam. xix. 10, which there, as elsewhere, has this sense. For the sentence compare also the question (originating perhaps in this very passage): μὴ ἰσχυρότεροι αὐτοῦ ἐσμέν? 1 Cor. x. 22.—Ver. 11. **Seeing there be many things that increase vanity.** That is, human life abounds in possessions, chances, vicissitudes of fortune, trials and dangers which strengthen in us the feeling of the vanity and weakness of this earthly existence, and show us that we are absolutely dependent on a higher power against which we cannot contend. The context decides against the ordinary rendering: "for there are many words which," *etc.*, [Sept., Vulg., and also EWALD, HITZIG, ELSTER and HAHN], for the reference to useless talk, *etc.*, is foreign to it.*—**What is man the better?** Namely, that he possesses, experiences, or enjoys these many things that simply increase

*[Ver. 10. "That which hath been is named already, and it is known that it is man." This rendering of our English Version seems to have little or no meaning, and points to no connection with the following verse. STUART's is little better. ZÖCKLER sheds no light upon it. He has no right to regard so distinct and emphatic a phrase as נִקְרָא שְׁמוֹ, as meaning simply a known existence in the past. The other interpretations, of EWALD, ELSTER, KNOBEL, VAIHINGER, HENGSTENBERG, RÖSENMUELLER. HAHN, fail to satisfy. Their very discrepancies as to the rendering of so simple a phrase as אשר הוא אדם, show that they have missed some fundamental idea which would at once take away from it all uncertainty. HITZIG's is the most unmeaning of them all. The older commentators, such as MUNSTERUS, MERCERUS, TIRINUS, PINEDA, AR. MONTANUS, GEIER, and even GROTIUS (see POLE's *Synopsis*) saw in it an allusion to the narrative, Gen. ii. 19, of Adam's giving names to things (*nomen inditum conveniens rei cujusque naturæ*) and to the name of Adam itself, as derived from Gen. ii. 7 and ver. 2. They fail however to bring it clearly out. Among the moderns, WORDSWORTH distinctly favors this view. See also the remarks of the spiritually minded MATTHEW HENRY. The key of the passage would seem to be given in the words כְּבָר נִקְרָא שְׁמוֹ (comp. Gen. ii. 19 הוּא שְׁמוֹ), "its name was named of old." There is no need of departing here from the most close and literal rendering, or for seeking any foreign idea in the word *naming*, as though it were a mere expression for existence (STUART and ZÖCKLER) or for being well-known. The reference is to the supposed fact, or idea, that names denote (as the best philology shows they were originally intended to denote) the nature of the thing named,—an idea which certainly seems to be implied in the account Gen. ii. 19. Keeping this in view, we get a clear meaning from the most literal rendering: מַה שֶּׁהָיָה "*what a thing is*" (מָה here used indefinitely like the Greek τι, Latin *quid*, *aliquid*, see Job xiii. 13; Prov. ix. 13; 2 Sam. xviii 27; Eccles. i. 9; iii. 15, 22; vii. 24; viii. 7; x. 14; or, with אֲשֶׁר or שֶׁ, *illud quod*), "*what each thing is*," or, "*each thing, what it is, its name was named of old*,"—that is, it was named according to *what it is* (comp. ARISTOTLE's peculiar expression for the idea, or individuality, of a thing, its τὸ τί ἦν εἶναι, *its being what it is*, or its being *something*). And then what follows is stated by way of example; the conjunction וְ being used comparatively as it often is: וְנוֹדָע, "*and so, known what he is* (אשר הוא), *is man*," or rather "Adam" (keeping the proper name in translation as the only way of giving force to the play upon the name. Thus known for what he is (by his name), or thus made known (*denoted* what he is) is Adam (man from earth). Then there is seen immediately the connection with the next verse, expressing his weakness as well as earthliness. The whole, then, may be thus paraphrased: 'Names of old were given to things, to each thing, according to their nature; so man was denoted, made known, or simply, *known*, from what he is, his earthliness and frailty.' The objection of ZÖCKLER in respect to the gender of מָה has no weight. It is taken indefinitely, and so *what* (*that which*) was used instead of *who*. Compare Ps. viii. 5 מָה אֱנוֹשׁ, Ps. cxliv. 3 מָה אָדָם, "*what is man?*" The Metrical Version follows a close literality at the expense of smoothness,—the words in brackets not at all adding to the sense, but necessary to give the English reader the play upon the name. It is as though there had been used the word *mortal*, which is taken in English for a name or epithet of man, or the Greek βροτὸς, which is so much used in HOMER for the same purpose. There is probably some allusion to the peculiar language of this passage in the Midrash Rabba (on Numb. xix.) where we have the following account: "When the Holy One had created Adam, He brought before him the animals, and said of each, see this (מה זה *what* is this), what is its name (מה שמו)? Adam said, this is שׁוֹר, shor, (ox)—this is חֲמוֹר, chamor, (ass)—this is סוּס, sus (horse), and so on. And thou—what is thy name? He answered, I should be called אָדָם, (Adam) because I was taken from adamah. And I,—what is my name? Thou shouldst be called אֲדֹנָי, Adonai, for Thou art Adon (אדון לכל בריותיך), the Lord of all Thy creatures." There can be good reasons given for Koheleth's philology here, but its correctness or incorrectness is of no account in reference to the allusion, or the idea of humanity which it conveys. See Genesis, p. 203, marginal note.—T. L.]

*[On the contrary the contrast seems clearly to point to the rendering *words*, although ZÖCKLER agrees here with our English Version, and with that of LUTHER. It is confirmed by what follows: "who knows"—"who can tell." It indicates the disputations which had commenced in the speculative or philosophical world, and which Solomon had doubtless heard of, although perhaps not familiar with them. His intercourse with the Egyptians, Phœnicians, Sabæans, and Arabians (perhaps with some of the more eastern people to whom his ships had gone), was sufficient for this purpose. The speculative mind began very early to inquire concerning the design and end of human life, *de finibus bonorum et malorum*. Philosophy was then rising in Greece; though, at this early time, its schools had not yet assumed shape. "Many were saying (רַבִּים אֹמְרִים, Ps. iv. 7) who will show us the good." We have seen how the Psalmist answers the questions there (Marg. note p. 95) by directing to the real good, אוֹר פָּנֶיךָ, the true εὐδαιμονία, the favor of God, or *blessedness* in distinction from mere *happiness*,—"*the light of Thy countenance*." Koheleth here regards as vanity all merely human disquisitions of this kind. They only "increase vanity" (see 1 Cor. viii. 1, ἡ γνῶσις φυσιοῖ. "knowledge puffeth up," *bloweth up*), or as it may be read, taking הֶבֶל adverbially, they multiply in vain." What is man the better for all this talk? Who knows what is good for him? Who can tell him what shall be after him? By way of contrast compare Ps. cxix. 129, 130: "Thy testimonies are wonderful; the entrance of *THY words* giveth light; they give understanding to the simple."—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

vanity.—Ver. 12. **For who knoweth what is good for man in this life?**—Namely, what of earthly things, whether happiness or unhappiness, wealth or poverty, the fulfilment of his desires or their disappointment. The concealed nature of man's own future is expressed by this question.—**All the days of his vain life.** Literally: "the number of the days," *etc.* מִסְפַּר (Com. v. 18) is the accusative of measure or duration.—**Which he spendeth as a shadow.** Literal: "and he passeth them," *etc.* Because 'יְמֵי (days of) is separated from יַעֲשֵׂם כַּצֵּל by a compound genitive, the copula is placed before this clause which is to be considered as relative (Hitzig). With עָשָׂה יְמֵי חַיִּים compare χρόνον ποιεῖν Acts xv. 33, *dies facere, Cicero ad Attic.* v. 20.—**For who can tell a man?** אֲשֶׁר, here, is not equivalent to "so that," but is substantially synonymous with כִּי "for," (comp. Deut. iii. 24; Dan. i. 10), expressing an affirmative and intensified sense. Comp. Ps. x. 6; Job v. 5; ix. 15; xix. 27. In the present clause the effort is certainly to intensify the truth that man is not permitted to look into the future of his earthly existence.—**What shall be after him under the sun.** "After him," *i. e.*, after his present condition, not after his death; comp. iii. 22; vii. 14; and see the exegetical illustrations to the former passage.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

(*With Homiletical Hints.*)

The theme of this section is too narrowly drawn, if, with Starke, we find only therein depicted "the extremely unhappy nature of the miser," or, with Hengstenberg, "the vanity of wealth," [and indeed, as Hengstenberg supposes, illustrated by the example of the rich Persians* and the poor Israelites]. That which in the present chapter is discountenanced, and presented as incompatible with true wisdom, is not merely the striving after money and possessions, but also the desire for honor, long life, many children (vers. 2, 3, 6), and, in short, *the struggle for earthly happiness in general.* And firstly, in vers. 1–6, wealth without a cheerful and contented feeling in the heart, then in vers. 7–9 sensual enjoyment without satisfaction of soul, and finally in vers. 10–12, a happy present with an obscure and uncertain future, are named as those things which must bring men to the consciousness of the vanity of all earthly goods and pleasures, and forbid them to strive after them. All the conditions and circumstances named, belong to those "many things that increase vanity," as found in ver. 11, and which, according to vers. 3–6, permit the longest life, and the one most richly blessed with posterity, to seem scarcely any better than the lot of an untimely birth that has not even seen the light of this world. It is a bitter and cutting thought, which, like the similar one in chap. iv. 2, f., is only softened and, as it were, excused by the admonition to a contented, resigned and grateful enjoyment and use of life, which clearly forms its background [distinctly visible in ver. 9], and again practically takes away the one-sided character of the apparent accusation of the Creator and Ruler of the world. Only the insatiable, ever-dissatisfied chasing after earthly means of happiness is thereby forbidden, as in opposition to the divinely-appointed task of human life. A temperate and modest striving after a cheerful and useful course of life, (which verse 8 expressly praises as the characteristic of the wise man) is emphatically recommended, not only in the preceding chap. v. 18–20, but in those immediately following [especially in chap. vii. 11 ff.] It is the cheerful and noble form of σωφροσύνη, that cardinal virtue, not merely of the ancient classical but also of biblical ethics, which forms the framework of this mainly gloomy and admonishing picture, and presents a corrective to contents so apparently dubious, and easily misunderstood.

The principal thought of this chapter might be well represented by the following quotations: "*Set your affections on things above, not on things on the earth;*" or, "*Lay not up for yourselves treasures on earth,*" *etc.;* or, "*And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth forever.*" (Col. iii. 2; Matt. vi. 19; 1 John ii. 17).

HOMILETICAL HINTS ON SEPARATE PASSAGES.

Vers. 1, 2. Brenz: The scheming and striving of our old Adam is of such a nature, that it measures the happiness of this life solely according to the abundance of treasures and riches. Let this old Adam go, for it is of no use! Dost thou think that nothing would be wanting to a happy life if thou only hadst an abundance of riches and honors? The matter is very different, as daily experience teaches.—Weimar Bible: The lamentations of the miser are not removed by excess of riches, by the number of children, or by long life; they are rather increased by these things (1 Tim. vi. 10).—Lange: The desire for temporal things clings to us all, and when we cease to watch and pray, we can soon be put to sleep, and charmed to our ruin, by such earthly love.

Ver. 3–6. Geier: A long life without rest and peace in God, is nothing but a long martyrdom.—Starke: To have many children is a special blessing of God (Ps. cxxvii. 3; cxxviii. 3, f.); but apart from the enjoyment of divine favor, this also is vanity.—Lange: What the untimely birth loses of natural life without any fault of its own, that the miser wantonly robs himself of in spiritual life. . . . . Because his soul has no firm foundation in communion with the good God, it goes to ruin, (Gal. vi. 8).

Vers. 7 and 8. Tübingen Bible: Above all things let us strive that our immortal spirit be filled with heavenly treasures, which alone can truly satisfy it.—Lange: He who cares not to appease and satisfy his soul, finds his proper

*[A false historical hypothesis, especially if it be in the face of the claim made by the writing itself, produces great mischief in continually warping exegesis. Nothing shows this more than Hengstenberg's continually turning the most general remarks into something about the Persians and the Persian times.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

place among fools, Luke xii. 19 f.—Hengstenberg: That the soul of man is never satisfied, notwithstanding his narrow capacity for enjoyment, is very strange, and a mighty proof of the degree to which our race, since Gen. i. 3, has yielded to sin and folly, producing "many foolish and hurtful lusts," (1 Tim. vi. 9).

Ver. 9. Luther: It is better that we use what is before our eyes, than that the soul should thus wander to and fro. Solomon means that we use the present and thank God for it, and not think of other things, like the dog in the fable that seizes the shadow and drops the meat. And he therefore says: what God has placed before thine eyes (the present) that use contentedly, and follow not thy soul which does not become filled.—Therefore let every Christian and believer rest with what he has, and be satisfied with what God has given him in the present! But the ungodly are not thus; all that they see is a torture to them; for they use not the present, their soul is never filled, and it wanders hither and thither. He who has immense sums of money has not enough; he does not use it but desires more; if he has one wife he is not satisfied but wants another; if he has a whole realm, he is not contented; as Alexander the Great could not be satisfied with one world.—Cramer: Be contented with what thou hast; this is better than in greed to be ever desiring other things.—Berleb. Bible: This is the wandering of the soul, that runs about among creatures, and, like Esau, on the field of this world, chases after a palatable food, which wisdom finds only at home, and in the repose of contentment.—Hengstenberg: It is better to rejoice in that which is before our eyes, however humble it may be, since man really needs so little, than to yield to the caprices of one's lusts, and to torture one's self with plans and hopes that so easily deceive us, or, if they are fulfilled, afford so little happiness.

Vers. 10 and 11. Cramer: That man should leave a pleasant name and memory behind is not unchristian; but the highest good does not consist therein. For as time discovereth all things, so it covereth all things up. (Ps. xxxi. 13; Ex. i. 8).—Hansen: All human things are subjected to God. He often deposes the highest from the throne of their glory where they least expect it, Dan. iv. 27-30.—Hengstenberg: If man is in a state of unconditional dependence on God, he should not permit to himself many vagaries, and should not torture himself with schemes and stratagems; because he cannot protect what he has acquired, and is not for a moment certain that he may not hear the cry: "thou fool, this night thy soul will be demanded of thee;" therefore it is foolish to envy the heathen because of their wealth, which can so soon wither away, like the flower of the field, James i. 10, 11.—The rich man has, in truth, no more than the poor one; what the former seems to have over the latter, proves, on closer inspection, to be but show and vanity. It disappears as soon as the judgments of God pass over the world.

Ver. 12. Luther: Men's hearts strive after all sorts of things: one seeks power, another wealth, and they know not that they will acquire them; thus they use not their present blessings, and their hearts ever aspire to that which they have not yet, and see not yet.—Why do we thus annoy and torture ourselves with our thoughts, when future things are not for a moment in our power? Therefore we should be contented with the present that God gives us now, and should commit all to God, who alone knows and rules both the present and the future.—Rambach: From all which it appears, that there is nothing better than to proscribe base avarice, be content with the present, and enjoy it with a pious cheerfulness.—Zeyss: Although a Christian may not know how it may be with the things of this world after his death, yet he can be assured by faith that he, after death, will be with Christ in heaven.—Hengstenberg: One would only be justified in esteeming wealth in case he knew the future, and had it in his power. The merest chance can suddenly rob one of all that has been gathered with pain and toil. A great catastrophe may come and sweep everything away as a flood. The practical result therefore is that one should strive after the true riches. As P. Gerard says: "*Earthly treasures dissolve and disappear, but the treasures of the soul never vanish.*"

B. The true Wisdom of Life consists in Contempt of the World, Patience, and Fear of God.

Chap. VII. 1-22.

1. In contempt of the world and its foolish lusts.

(Vers. 1-7.)

1 A good name *is* better than precious ointment; and the day of death than the
2 day of one's birth. *It is* better to go to the house of mourning, than to go to the
house of feasting; for that *is* the end of all men; and the living will lay *it* to his
3 heart. Sorrow *is* better than laughter: for by the sadness of the countenance the

Digitized by Google

4 heart is made better. The heart of the wise *is* in the house of mourning; but the
5 heart of fools *is* in the house of mirth. *It is* better to hear the rebuke of the wise,
6 than for a man to hear the song of fools: For as the crackling of thorns under a
7 pot, so *is* the laughter of the fool: this also *is* vanity. Surely oppression maketh
a wise man mad; and a gift destroyeth the heart.

2. In a patient, calm, and resigned spirit.

(Vers. 8–14.)

8 Better *is* the end of a thing than the beginning thereof: *and* the patient in spirit *is*
9 better than the proud in spirit. Be not hasty in thy spirit to be angry: for anger
10 resteth in the bosom of fools. Say not thou, What is *the cause* that the former days
11 were better than these? for thou dost not inquire wisely concerning this. Wisdom
12 *is* good with an inheritance: and *by it there is* profit to them that see the sun. For
wisdom *is* a defence, *and* money *is* a defence: but the excellency of knowledge *is*,
13 *that* wisdom giveth life to them that have it. Consider the work of God: for who
14 can make *that* straight, which He hath made crooked? In the day of prosperity
be joyful, but in the day of adversity consider: God also hath set the one over
against the other, to the end that man should find nothing after him.

3. In earnest fear of God, and penitential acknowledgment of sin.

(Vers. 15–22.)

15 All *things* have I seen in the days of my vanity: there is a just *man* that perisheth
in his righteousness, and there is a wicked *man* that prolongeth *his life* in his
16 wickedness. Be not righteous over much; neither make thyself over wise: why
17 shouldest thou destroy thyself? Be not over much wicked, neither be thou foolish:
18 why shouldest thou die before thy time? *It is* good that thou shouldest take hold
of this; yea, also from this withdraw not thine hand: for he that feareth God
19 shall come forth of them all. Wisdom strengtheneth the wise more than ten
20 mighty *men* which are in the city. For *there is* not a just man upon earth, that
21 doeth good, and sinneth not. Also take no heed unto all words that are spoken;
22 lest thou hear thy servant curse thee: For oftentimes also thine own heart knoweth
that thou thyself likewise hast cursed others.

[Ver. 3. כַּעַס. The primary sense is *excitement* of mind, or *feeling*, of any kind, or from any cause. Fuerst, *commotum, concitatum esse*. It is like the Greek θυμὸς, or ὀργὴ, in this respect. It may be *grief* (sorrow), or *anger*. The context determines. Here, in ver. 3, it evidently means the opposite of שְׂחוֹק *laughter, mirth, joy*. In ver. 9th, on the other hand, it must have the sense of *anger*, though both ideas are probably combined.—T. L.]

[Ver. 7. עֹשֶׁק means the *disposition* or state of mind from which oppression comes (ὕβρις, *insolence, pride*) rather than the act. It is also to be determined from the context whether it is violence, insolence, *etc.*, exercised *upon* the wise man, or *by* him, that is, whether it is objective, or subjective. The latter sense, here, best suits the context. Such a spirit in the wise man may make mad even *him*, or make him decide wrong, if we regard חָכָם, here, as meaning a judge.—T. L.]

[Ver. 12. בְּצֵל is regarded by some of the best critics as a case of beth essentiæ, or as having an assertive force, as in the Arabic, but there is no good reason for this.—T. L.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. This section, which describes the nature of genuine, practical wisdom, just as the preceding one presents the contrary, is clearly divided into three divisions or strophes. The *first* of these (vers. 1–7) treats of the contempt of worldly pleasure, and the sacred earnestness of life,—the *second*, (vers. 8–14) of a forbearing, patient, and resigned disposition,—the *third*, (vers. 15–22) of godly demeanor, and humble self-appreciation, as conditions and essential characteristics of that wisdom. A division of these three strophes into half strophes is superfluous (Vaihinger); there is only observable a sharper and deeper incision in the train of thought, in the middle of the last strophe, or in the transition from the fear of God to self-appreciation, after verse 18.

2. *First Strophe:* Vers. 1–7. Of the advantage of a stern contempt of the world over foolish worldly pleasure.—**A good name is better than precious ointment.** Comp. Prov. xxii. 1, where שֵׁם signifies, just as in this passage, a good name, a good reputation or fame; see also Job xxx. 8, and for the paronomasia in שֵׁם and שֶׁמֶן see Canticles i. 3. [In this place Zöckler gives us specimens of play

upon words in German, such as arise from Gerücht and Wohlgeruch, *etc.*, which are not translatable, except by a general reference to the metaphors to be found in English and other languages, wherein *character*, *reputation*, *etc.*, is said to have its good or evil odor. It might be compared with the opposite Hebrew word הִבְאִישׁ he stank, *odiosus fuit*, 1 Sam. xxvii. 12.—T. L. —**And the day of death than the day of one's birth.** For the suffix in הִוָּלְדוֹ comp. v. 18; viii. 16; Isa. xvii. 5; Jer. xl. 5 and similar cases of relation of a definite suffix to an indefinite subject. The sentence is the same as chap. iv. 8; vi. 3–5. It here serves as a preparation for the following sentences, whose aim is to heighten the duty of a sacred earnestness of life, just as the commendation, in the first clause, of a good name as something better than precious ointment, is to pave the way for this recommendation of a serious disposition despising the pleasures of the world. In this common relation of the two clauses to the fundamental thought of the necessity of a serious purpose, lies the inward connection, which we may no more deny [with HENGSTENBERG and many others] than erroneously assert on the basis of the false assumption that the second clause refers specially to the fool, or through any other similar subtilties. ELSTER is correct in saying: "Because a good and reputable name, which secures an ideal existence with posterity, is more valuable than all sensual pleasure, such as is obtained through precious ointments, therefore the day of death must seem to bring more happiness than the day of birth; for this ideal existence of posthumous fame does not attain its full power and purity until after death: but external pleasures and enjoyments, which we are accustomed to desire for a man on the day of his birth, pleasures which are dependent on his sensual life, prove to be more empty and vain than the joy afforded by the thought of a spiritual existence in the memory of posterity."—Ver. 2. **It is better to go to a house of mourning.** That is, a house wherein there is mourning for one deceased, "a house of lamentation" (LUTHER). The connection of the expression favors this sense of the significant בֵּית אֵבֶל, taken backwards as well as forwards; and also with ver. 3 f. For the expression for בֵּית מִשְׁתֶּה "house of carousal," of drinking (not specially a drinking resort) compare the similar expression in Esther vii. 8. For the entire sentence comp. the Arabic proverb (SCHULTEN's *Anthology*, p. 48, 73): "If thou hearest lamentation for the dead enter into the place; but if thou art bidden to a banquet pass not the threshold." **For that is the end of all men.** "That," (הוּא) *i. e.*, not the mourning, but the fact that a house becomes a house of mourning. It is therefore הוּא for הִיא on account of the attraction of סוֹף as HITZIG rightly regards it.— **And the living will lay it to his heart.** Ver. 3. **Sorrow is better than laughter.** כַּעַס here, does not, of course, mean that passionate sorrow or anger against which we are warned as a folly in ver. 9, but is essentially the same as אֵבֶל in ver. 2, consequently a grief salutary, and nearest allied to that godly sorrow spoken of 2 Cor. vii. 10. For שְׂחוֹק, "laughter," boisterous, worldly merriment, comp. ii. 2, and also ver. 6.—**For by the sadness of the countenance the heart is made better.**—רֹעַ פָּנִים, like פָּנִים רָעִים, Gen. xl. 7; Neh. ii. 2, signifies not an evil countenance, but a sad, sorrowful one, and יִיטַב לֵב is not to be understood of the moral amendment, but of the cheering up and gladdening of the heart;* comp. the Latin, *cor bene se habet*, as also the parallels chap. xi. 9; Judges xix. 6, 9; Ruth iii. 7; 1 Kings xxi. 7. But cheerfulness and contentment of the heart, with a sad countenance, can only be imagined where its thoughts have begun to take the normal direction in a religious and moral aspect; moral amendment is therefore in any case the presupposition of הֵיטִיב לֵב, and there is, therefore, no contradiction but the clearest harmony with Prov. xiv. 13; xv. 13; xvii. 22; xviii. 14.—Ver. 4. **The heart of the wise is in the house of mourning.** Drawing his conclusion from vers. 2 and 3, the author returns to the expression of the second sentence. Because a serious disposition is everywhere more salutary than boisterous worldly merriment, it is plain that the former will be peculiar to the wise man, as the latter to the fool. VAIHINGER observes very correctly, "that one perceives from this passage that the preacher, however often he recommends enjoyment of life, never means thereby boisterous pleasures and blind sensual enjoyment, but rather worthy and grateful enjoyment of the good and the beautiful offered by God. Such an enjoyment is not only possible with a serious course of life, but is indeed only thereby attainable."—Ver. 5. **It is better to hear the rebuke of the wise.** For גַּעֲרָה, "rebuke," censure, reproof on account of foolish or criminal behaviour, comp. Prov. xiii. 1. Intercourse with wise men, *i. e.*, strictly moral and religious individuals, who can easily impart those censures, belongs to those expressions of a serious, world-contemning spirit, of which a few other examples have been cited, such as to "go into the house of mourning," to "be of a sad countenance."—**Than for a man to hear the song of fools.** Literal: "Than a man hearing the song of fools." Flattering speeches are not specially meant here (Vulg. *adulatio*), but the extravagant, boisterous and immoral songs that are heard in the riotous carousals of foolish men, in the בֵּית מִשְׁתֶּה or "house of feasting." Comp. Job xxi. 12; Amos vi. 5; Isa. v. 11, 12.—Ver. 6. **For as the crackling of thorns under a pot.** The fire of dry thorns, quickly blazing up, and burning with loud crackling and snapping, and also quickly consumed (comp. Ps. lviii. 9; cxx. 4; and especially cxviii. 12) is here chosen

*[See Metrical Version, and the remarks on this passage Introd. to Met. Vers. page 179.—T. L.]

as the emblem of the loud, boisterous, and vacant laughter of foolish men, who are at the same time destitute of all deeper moral worth. **This also is vanity**; namely, all this noisy, merry, vacant and unfruitful conduct of fools.—Ver. 7. **Surely oppression maketh a wise man mad; and a gift destroyeth the heart.** כִּי in the beginning of this verse can neither be considered as containing a cause or a motive [this is the opinion of the most commentators, also of HITZIG, VAIHINGER, HENGSTENBERG, HAHN, *etc.*), nor as an adversative equivalent to "yet," or "but" [EWALD, ELSTER]. Like the אֲשֶׁר in chap. vi. 12, it here clearly expresses an intensifying sense (comp. כִּי in Isa. v. 7; Job vi. 21, *etc.*). The connection with the preceding is as follows: So great is the vanity of fools, and so powerfully and rapidly does it spread, like the blazing fire of thorns, that even the wise man is in danger of being infected by it; and deluded from the path of probity in consequence of brilliant positions of power, striving after riches, offers of presents or bribes, *etc.* עֹשֶׁק (for which EWALD in his *Biblical Annual* 1856, p. 156, unnecessarily proposed to read עֹשֶׁר—a conjecture abandoned by him afterwards) does not mean in a passive sense the oppression of the wise man by others, but rather the "pressure" which he is tempted to exercise, just as מַתָּנָה means a "present," or bribe which is offered to him. The wise man is regarded as a judge, who, in the exercise of his functions, needs true wisdom, so much the more because he may easily be deluded by bribery and be tempted to misuse his official power. For the expressions הוֹלֵל "to delude, to make a fool of," and אִבֵּד לֵב "to corrupt the heart," *corrumpere*, comp. Isa. xliv. 25; Jer. iv. 9.* For the sentence see Deut. xvi. 19; Sirach xx. 27; [but not Prov. xvii. 8; xviii. 16; xix. 6, *etc.*, where allowable giving is meant].

8. *Second strophe.* Vers. 8–14. Of the value of patience, tranquility, and resignation to the will of God. **Better is the end of a thing than the beginning thereof.** The sense is not the same as in ver. 1, but rather, according to the second verse, as follows: it is better quietly to await the course of an affair until its issue, and not to judge and act until then, than to proceed rashly and with passionate haste, and bring upon one's self its bad consequences. The peculiar sense of אֶרֶךְ־רוּחַ corresponds to the calm demeanor expressed by the term "long-suffering" in the sense of the New Testament μακροθυμία (Col. i. 11; Heb. vi. 12, 15; James v. 7, 8); and for the violent temper described in the second place, we have the state of mind denoted by the word גְּבַהּ־רוּחַ, "haughty," or "presumptuous." Comp. 1 Kings xx. 11.—Ver. 9. **Be not hasty in thy spirit to be angry.** The word כַּעַס "to be morose," sensitive [see remarks on ver. 8 above], is a peculiar species of haughtiness mentioned in the previous verse, and one very frequently and easily occurring; it is not fully expressed by גְּבַהּ רוּחַ, as HENGSTENBERG supposes [quite as little as אֶרֶךְ רוּחַ is expressed by אֶרֶךְ אַפַּיִם βραδὺς εἰς ὀργήν, James i. 19].—**For anger rests in the bosom of fools**; that is, a fretful, irritable disposition is mainly found in fools, is deeply rooted in their nature and has its home there. For נוּחַ, in this sense see Prov. xiv. 33; Isa. xi. 2; xxv. 11. For the sentence see Job v. 2; Prov. xii. 16.—Ver. 10. **Say not what is the cause,** *etc.* Finding fault with the present, and a one-sided praise of past times, is a well-known characteristic of peevish and fretful dispositions, and of those surly carpers at fate of ver. 16, and those *difficiles, queruli, laudatores temporis acti* of the Horatian *epistola ad Pisones*, (line 178). **For thou dost not inquire wisely concerning this.** That is, not so that thy question is made on the basis of wise reflection, and therefore proceeds from this source. Comp. the similar use of the preposition מִן, chap. ii. 10; Ps. xxviii. 7.—Vers. 11 and 12. The praise of wisdom, in so far as it is in harmony with a thoughtful, patient, and even soul.—**Wisdom is good with an inheritance.** [ZÖCKLER: as an inheritance].

עִם נַחֲלָה does not mean "with an inheritance or fortune," as if the sense were the same as that in chap. v. 18 (Sept., Vulg., LUTHER). The connection decides against this, as well as against the view of EWALD: "in comparison with an inheritance," and against the still more unfitting view of HAHN: "wisdom is good against destiny." (!) עִם is undoubtedly used in the same sense as in chap. ii. 16; Gen. xviii.

*[The common view of this passage as given in E. V., which makes the wise man the *object* of oppression, is unquestionably wrong, though so often quoted and used as historical illustration. It does not agree with הוֹלֵל, which does not mean the madness of frenzy caused by a sense of wrong, but vain glory, extravagance, inflation, coming from inward wrong-feeling. ZÖCKLER is doubtless right in saying that it does not denote *passively* the oppression which the wise man suffers from others; but his rendering "pressure" seems forced and far from being clear. עֹשֶׁק may denote a state of soul leading to wrong and oppression, as well as the outward act itself; as in Ps. lxxiii. 8, וִידַבְּרוּ עֹשֶׁק is parallel to מִמָּרוֹם יְדַבֵּרוּ, "they speak lofty," arrogantly. Compare also Isaiah lix. 13, where it is joined with סָרָה "perverseness," and falsehood. See also Ps. lxii. 11. The connection, then, is with ver. 5: "To hear the reproving of the wise is better than to listen to the song of fools." Ver. 6 is simply an illustration of what is meant by the song of fools, and then follows the brief clause, "this too is vanity," which, although connected by the accents with ver. 6, must refer to the whole context that precedes: since it would seem superfluous thus to characterize simply the empty talk of fools. It is frequently the case in Koheleth that an admonition, or serious maxim, given in one sentence, is afterwards qualified, if not wholly modified or retracted, in another; as though there were some vanity even in the gravest of human words or acts. גַּם־זֶה הָבֶל "this too may be vanity." that is, "the reproof of the *wise*," or of the *judge*, (as ZÖCKLER, from the context, correctly regards him); for his own arrogance, or perverseness of temper, may lead him astray, or a bribe may corrupt his heart. And thus there is brought out, what seems evidently intended, a contrast between the inward and outward deranging power.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

23; Ps. lxxiii. 5; Job ix. 26.*—**And by it there is profit to them that see the sun;** *i. e.*, for the living (comp. vi. 5; and the Homeric ὁρᾶν φάος ἠελίοιο, also the Latin, *diem videre*). HERZFELD, HITZIG, and HENGSTENBERG unnecessarily take יֹתֵר in the adverbial sense of "more, better still," in order to let the second clause appear as an intensification of the first. The adjective or rather the substantive sense, corresponds better to the poetical character of the passage, and is equivalent to יִתְרוֹן: in support of which chap. vi. 8 may be quoted, and in which the second clause becomes the exact parallel of the first.—Ver. 12. **For wisdom is a defence, and money is a defence.** (Lit. Ger., in the shadow of wisdom, in the shadow of money). That is, he who dwells in the shadow of wisdom is just as much protected as he who passes his life in the protection of much money; therefore an exact parallel in sense with ver. 11, first clause. SYMMACHUS is correct: σκέπει σοφια ὡς σκέπει τὸ ἀργύριον; but the Vulgate is not wholly so: "*Sicut enim protegit sapientia, sic protegit pecunia.*" KNOBEL and HITZIG are too artificial in saying that בְּ here is the *beth essentiæ*, which would be therefore translated: "Wisdom is a shadow, (that is a defence) and money is a shadow." בְּצֵל is rather to be taken here as in Ps. xci. 1, where it is parallel with בְּסֵתֶר. The shadow is here used as a symbol of protection, with the subordinate idea of the agreeable, as also in Ps. cxxi. 4; Isa. xxx. 2, 3; xxxii. 2; Lamentations iv. 20, *etc.*—**But the excellence of knowledge is;** *i. e.*, the advantage that knowledge (דַּעַת comp. i. 16) has over money, that which makes it more valuable than money. דַּעַת here alternates with חָכְמָה simply on account of the poetical parallelism.—**Wisdom giveth life to them that have it;** lit., "it animates him" (תְּחַיֶּה). חיה is not "to keep in life" (HITZIG), but "to *grant* life," *i. e.*, to bestow a genuine happy life. Comp. Job xxxvi. 6; Ps. xvi. 11; xxxviii. 9; Prov. iii. 18; especially the last passage, which may be quoted as most decisive for our meaning. HENGSTENBERG lays too much stress on תְּחַיֶּה, in claiming for it the sense of reanimating, of the resurrection of that which was spiritually dead (according to Hosea vi. 2; Luke xv. 32, *etc.*); and KNOBEL too little, when he declares: "wisdom affords a calm and contented spirit."*

—Ver. 13. **Consider the work of God; for who can make that straight which He hath made crooked?** A return to the exhortations to a calm, patient spirit (vers. 9 and 10), with reference to God's wise and unchangeable counsel and will, to which we must yield in order to learn true patience and tranquility. The connection between the first and second clauses is as follows: In observing the works of God thou wilt find that His influence is eternal and immutable; for who can make that straight which He hath made crooked, *i. e.*, harmonize the defects and imperfections of human life decreed by Him; comp. i. 15; vi. 10; Job xii. 14; Rom. ix. 9. As this connection of thought is evident enough, one need not, with HITZIG and others, take כִּי in the sense of "that," to which indeed the interrogative form of the second clause would be unfitting.—Ver. 14. **In the day of prosperity be joyful.**—בְּטוֹב is equivalent to בְּלֶב־טוֹב. Comp. chap. ix. 7; 1 Kings viii. 66; Sir. xiv. 14.—**But in the day of adversity consider.** "Behold, look at, observe" [namely the following truth]; comp. רָאָה in ver. 13. EWALD is harsh and artificial in his rendering: "and bear the day of misfortune," taking רָאָה בְּ in a sense that he claims is sustained by Gen. xxi. 16.—**God also hath set the one over against the other.** This is the substance of that which one must consider in adversity, fully corresponding with what Job says in ii. 10. —**To the end that man should find nothing after him;** *i. e.*, in order that he may fathom nothing that lies beyond his present condition (אַחֲרָיו as in iii. 22; vi. 12), or in order that the future that lies behind him, or, according to our more usual expression, that lies before him, remain hidden and concealed from him, and that he may, in no wise, count on it, but rather remain in all things unconditionally dependent on God, and His grace (ELSTER, VAIHINGER and HENGSTENBERG are correct on this point). עַל דִּבְרַת שֶׁלֹּא, lit.: "on account of that, that not" (comp. עַל דִּבְרַת, "on account of," chap. iii. 18; viii. 2) is not equivalent to "so that not," [LUTHER in his *Commentary*], or, "therefore, because not" [HITZIG and HAHN], but clearly introduces the divine dispensation in assigning sometimes good and sometimes evil days; therefore it should be rendered "to the end that."

*[There seems no good reason for departing here from the usual sense of עִם *with, in connection with.* The other passages referred to explain themselves. The word נַחֲלָה, as used in many places, does not mean inheritance generally, like יְרֻשָּׁה, but a rich and ample possession, in a most favorable sense, as one given by the Lord, or inherited from one's father, an *estate*, or property. The sense is obvious: Wisdom is a good alone, but when joined with an ample estate, as a means of doing good, then is it especially an advantage to the sons of men. See Metrical Version.—T. L.]

†[Ver. 12. הַחָכְמָה תְּחַיֶּה, rendered "wisdom giveth life." We cannot help thinking that Koheleth means more here than ZÖCKLER's interpretation would give, or any of the others he mentions. There is a contrast, too, giving the connection of thought, which they all fail to bring out. "In the shade of wisdom, as in the shade of wealth;" that is, in both is there a defence. Defence of what? Of *life* evidently. In this they both agree; but knowledge, wisdom (variety of expression for the same thing), does more than this. Its great pre-eminence is, that it giveth *life* to its possessors (תְּחַיֶּה makes them alive). This means something more than mere animating, in the ordinary sense of cheering, enlivening, or making happy, *etc.* Knowledge *is* life. *Vivere est cogitare.* It is, in a high sense, the *soul's being*. It is true of mere human knowledge, science, philosophy, intuition. Much more may it be said of divine or spiritual knowledge. "Man *lives* not by bread alone, but by every word that proceeds from the mouth of God," Deut. viii. 3; Matt. iv. 4. "The words that I speak unto you, they are *spirit*, and they are life," John vi. 63. It is not merely spiritual, that is, *moral* reanimation, as HENGSTENBERG would have it, but the very life of the soul. It is a sufficient argument against the other interpretations given, that in falling short of this they lose the contrast, and fail to exhibit that connection to which the antithetical nicety of the proverbial diction evidently points.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

4. *Third strophe.* Vers. 15–22. Of the value of the fear of God and humble self-appreciation. **All things have I seen,** *etc.* "All," *i. e.*, not all kinds [LUTHER, VAIHINGER, HENGSTENBERG], but everything possible, everything that can come into consideration, everything to whose consideration I could be directed (according to vers. 13 and 14). **In the days of my vanity.** *i. e.*, since I belong to this vain, empty life of earth. There is no indication that these vain days passed completely by during the life of the speaker,* and this passage cannot, therefore, be used as a proof that Solomon, who became repentant in his old age, is the speaker.—**There is a just man that perisheth in his righteousness.**—יֵשׁ, "there is," does not belong to אֹבֵד, but to צַדִּיק, therefore the meaning is not "the just man perisheth." בְּצִדְקוֹ is not "*through* his righteousness" (UMBREIT, VAIHINGER, HITZIG); but *in* it; comp. EWALD, *Lehrbuch*, § 217, 3, f. The intention here is to announce something which Koheleth saw, an evident fact; but this is only the external connection, the association of righteousness and misfortune; not, on the contrary, the misfortune effected through righteousness. The same thing occurs in the following clause, where בְּרָעָתוֹ is not to be understood as "*through*," but *in*, that is, *in spite* of his wickedness. But the author desires by no means to present that righteousness in which one perisheth as blameless, but has doubtless here in view, as in the subsequent verse, that self-righteousness, that apparent outward righteousness which our Lord so often had to censure in the Pharisees (Matt. v. 20; Luke v. 32; xv. 7, *etc.*) and which appeared quite early in Old Testament history as a religiously moral tendency, comp. Int. § 4, Obs. 3.—**And there is a wicked man that prolongeth his life in his wickedness.** מַאֲרִיךְ with יָמִים understood, comp. viii. 12, 13; Deut. xxii. 7; Prov. xxviii. 2, 16, *etc.*—Ver. 16. **Be not righteous overmuch, neither make thyself overwise.** Clearly a warning against that strictly exact, but hypocritical and external righteousness of those predecessors of the Pharisees to whom the preceding verse referred. הִתְחַכֵּם (Reflexive of חָכַם "to make wise") can scarcely here signify anything else than as in Ex. i. 10; therefore *sapientem se gessit*, not *sapientem se putavit*. This expression "make thyself not over wise," is consequently not a warning against vainly imagining that one is wise, but against the effort to appear eminently wise, and against a pretentious assumption of the character of a teacher of wisdom, in short, against that Pharisaical error† which Christ censures in Matt. xxiii. 6, 7: φιλοῦσιν — καλεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ῥαββί, ῥαββί. **Why shouldst thou destroy thyself?** Namely by the curse which God has put upon the vices of arrogance and hypocrisy; Comp. Christ's expressions of woe unto you Pharisees! in Matt. xxiii. HITZIG says: "Why wilt thou isolate thyself?" This is a useless enfeebling of the sense; for ver. 15, as well as vers. 17 and 18 show that the warning of the author is meant in all seriousness, and that he refers to divine and not merely human punishment. Comp. also the sentence of Ezekiel xxxiii. 11, so closely allied with this present one: "Why will ye die; O

---

†[There is no indication to the contrary, it should rather be said. The Hebrew is remarkably plain, and there is no way of making it mean "since I belong to this vain empty life." This is too much practised by those who deny the Solomonic origin of the book, thus to take away the force of certain passages that plainly speak for it, and then to reason on their own false hypothesis. Had this expression not occurred at all, the whole book furnishes evidence that it was written by one who had an unusual experience of the vanities and vicissitudes of life. A mere personator could never have expressed it so feelingly.—T. L.]

*[Ver. 16. "*Be not over-righteous*," *etc.* There is no reason for regarding צַדִּיק, in the 15th verse, as having any other than its ordinary sense, or the truly righteous man. It is the same experience that Koheleth presents elsewhere, the just man in this world having the same lot as the wicked, and sometimes suffering when the wicked seems to escape with impunity,—like the experience of the Psalmist, Ps. lxxiii. 4, 5. The צַדִּיק, in the 16th verse, is, doubtless, suggested by that in the preceding, but such a fact would not necessitate their having precisely the same meaning: since the connection may be poetical, or suggestive, rather than logical. ZÖCKLER's idea, therefore, of its meaning here the self righteous, or Pharisaical, might be sustained, perhaps, without carrying the idea into the preceding verse. His view of the צַדִּיק הַרְבֵּה, the over-righteous, is very similar to that of JEROME, who interprets the passage as a condemnation of one who over-judges, *rigidum et trucem ad omnia fratrum peccata*,—the worthy father, perhaps, little thinking how distinctly he was giving a feature of his own character. "Do not," he says, "in this respect, be too just (that is, too rigid), because 'an unjust weight,' be it too great or too small, 'is an abomination to the Lord.'" And then he cites our Lord's precept, Matt. vii., Judge not. *etc.* The being over-wise he refers to proud or curious inquiring into the hidden works and ways of God, such as Paul condemns, Rom. ix. 20, and the *confounding* to the effect produced by God's rebuke, or such an answer as the Apostle gives: "Nay, who art thou, O man?" STUART renders it, "do not overdo" RABBI SCHELOMO, following the Targum and Jewish authorities so early as to be referred to by JEROME, regards צַדִּיק as meaning *kind* or *merciful*, and alleges the example of Saul, who through mistaken clemency, spared the life of AGAG. Others refer it to a too strict judging of the ways of Providence, or the arraigning them for what seems to us unjust; as when we see the righteous perish and the wicked man living on in his wickedness. An argument for this interpretation is the support it seems to have from ver. 15. Another interpretation regards it as a caution against asceticism and moroseness, in denying one's self innocent pleasures for fear of finding sin in them. This is the view of MAIMONIDES in the *Yad Hachasukah*, Part I., Lib. IV., Sec. III., 3, 4. Akin to this is the view, stated by him, which regards it as rebuking works of supererogation,—as when a man attempts to do more than the law requires.

If we keep in view, however, the general scope of this musing, meditative, book, it will be found we think, that the two members here mean very much the same thing: Do not view the world, or the ways of God, too narrowly, as though we, from our exceedingly limited position, could determine what it would be just or unjust for God to do, or permit. This is in harmony with the preceding verse. It furnishes us with a key to the transition in the train of thought: When you see the righteous suffer, and the wicked prosper, do not let the thought, or even feeling, arise in your mind that you could, or would, be more equitable, if you had the management of the world. This is agreeable to the general style of Koheleth,—one thought correcting what seems too strongly stated, or which may be liable to misunderstanding, in another. It is also in perfect harmony with what follows: "Be not overwise;" that is do not speculate too much, or theorize too much, אַל תִּתְחַכַּם, do not play the philosopher too much; you know too little; your Baconianism (as he might have said had he lived in these our boasting times) has too small an area of inductive facts from which to construct systems of the universe (especially in its moral and spiritual aspects) out of nebular hypotheses. This corresponds with what is said chap. iii. 11, about "the world so given to the minds of men that they cannot find out the work that God worketh, the end from the begin-

Digitized by Google

house of Israel?" and also Eccles. iv. 5. Ver. 17. **Be not over much wicked, neither be thou foolish.** Koheleth does not recommend a certain moderation in wickedness as though he considered it allowable, but simply and alone because he recognizes the fact as generally acknowledged and certain that in some respects at least, every man is somewhat wicked by nature; see vers. 20-22. He who is "over much wicked" is the maliciously wicked or downright ungodly one (הָרָשָׁע), who sins not merely from weakness, but with consciousness of evil (comp. Lev. xlii. 27; Numb. xv. 27; Eccles. v. 6). Such a one is *eo ipso* "foolish" (סָכָל) *μαινόμενος τῇ ἀδικίᾳ*, that is, a fool in the sense of Ps. xiv. 1; liii. 1.—**Why shouldst thou die before thy time?** That is, before the time assigned thee by God. For this thought of the shortening of the days of the wicked through divine justice,* comp. Prov. x. 27; Ps. lv. 23; Job xv. 32; xxii. 16.—Ver. 18. **It is good that thou shouldst take hold of this; yea, from this also withdraw not thine hand.** A recommendation to avoid the two extremes of false righteousness and bold wickedness (of the Pharisees and Sadducees) harmonizing with the thought of HORACE: "*Medium tenuere beati; medio tutissimus ibis:*" and this is not meant in the superficial sense of the ethical eclecticism of the later Greeks and Romans, but in that stern religious sense, which the Lord expresses when, in Matt. xxiii. 23, in words most nearly allied to these, (*ταῦτα δὲ ἔδει ποιῆσαι κἀκεῖνα μὴ ἀφιέναι*) He *demands the most conscientious connection between the outer and the inner fulfilment of the law.*—**For he who feareth God shall come forth of them all.** Namely from the bad consequences of false righteousness and those of indecent contempt of the law, and bold immorality. יָצָא with the accusative, signifies here as in Jer. x. 20, (בָּנַי יְצָאֻנִי, "my children desert me"), Gen. xliv. 4 (יָצְאוּ אֶת־הָעִיר "they went out of the city"), Amos iv. 3, *etc.*: "to go from something, to escape a thing," (comp. also 1 Sam. xiv. 41). HITZIG's view gives a somewhat different sense: "He who feareth God goes with both," *i. e.*, does not strive to exceed the just medium; this is similar to the Vulgate (*nihil negligit*) and to the Syriac (*utrique inhæret*). But the *usus loquendi* is rather more in favor of the former meaning. Ver. 19. **Wisdom strengtheneth the wise.** Lit., "proves itself strong to him (תָּעֹז לֶחָכָם) more than," *etc.*, *i. e.*, it protects him better, defends him more effectually. **More than ten mighty men which are in the city**; than ten heroes which are at the head of the troops, than ten commanders surrounded by their forces, to whom the defence of the besieged city is entrusted. For the sentence comp. Prov. x. 15, (where קִרְיַת עֻזּוֹ reminds of עָזַז לְ) xxi. 22; xxiv. 5. The wisdom whose mightily protecting and strengthening influence is here lauded, is of course, that genuine wisdom which is in harmony with the fear of God; it is that disposition and demeanor which hold the true evangelical mean between the extremes of false righteousness and lawlessness, which forms the necessary contrast and the corrective to "the being over wise" censured in ver. 16.—Ver. 20. **For there is not a just man upon earth who doeth good and sinneth not.** Therefore (this is the unexpressed conclusion), every one needs this true wisdom for his protection against the justice of God; no one can dispense with this only reliable guide in the way of truth. This sentence confirms the 19th verse in the first place, and then the whole preceding warning against the extremes of hypocrisy and impenitence. Comp. the similar confessions of the universal sinfulness of our race in Ps. cxxx. 3; cxliii. 2; Job ix. 2; xiv. 3; Prov. xx. 9; 1 Kings viii. 46.—Vers. 21 and 22 are not simply connected with ver. 20, as KNOBEL supposes, (who brings out the sequence of thought by means of the idea that as sinners we fall short of our duty, and cause adverse judgments against ourselves) but is also connected with all the preceding verses from the 15th on, so that the connection of ideas is as follows:* You will certainly receive the manifold censure of men for living according to the doctrines of this wisdom (you will be considered hypocritical, excessively austere, eccentric, *etc.*,); but do not

---

ning." It is the same idea that we have chap. viii. 17: "Man cannot find out the work that is done under the sun, and even if a wise man (a philosopher) say that he knows it, he shall not be able to discover it." The *Vulgate* renders it, *neque plus sapias quam necesse est.* JEROME, in his Latin Version, *ne quæras amplius*, LXX *μὴ σοφίζου.* The whole precept, then, may be taken as a condemnation of that spirit which would be more just and wise than God. No man professes this, or would even admit that he thus feels, yet it is realized when any one, in any way, finds fault with, or even doubts, or has difficulty with, the ways of God in the world. Such a temper is also condemned Eccles. v. 8: "If thou seest oppression of the poor, *etc.*, be not astonished concerning such a matter, for He who is high above all is watching them." Compare also Job iv. 7, where the Spirit-voice says to Eliphaz הַאֱנוֹשׁ מֵאֱלוֹהַּ יִצְדָּק, "shall a man (*βροτὸς mortalis*) be more just than God?" This is being צַדִּיק הַרְבֵּה. So also Ps. xxxvii. 1: "Fret not thyself against the evil doers." The Hithpahel form, תִּתְחַכַּם, would authorize us to understand it of a seeming or affected wisdom, but it more properly means here a prying into the divine mysteries, whether of revelation, or of the supernatural, or an arrogant denial of both, grounded on the comparative infinitesimality of our knowledge.

לָמָּה תִּשּׁוֹמֵם (for the fuller Hithpahel תִּשְׁתּוֹמֵם) *ne obstupescas* (JEROME); rather "why shouldst thou be desolate," or "make thyself desolate," which would correspond to the first interpretation of תתחכם, "alone in thy wisdom;" or "why shouldst thou be confounded." He who presumes to settle matters too high for him, will surely, in some way, be taught his ignorance and his folly.—T. L.

* The Syriac has something here which is not in the Hebrew, nor in any other version, דלא תסתנא "that thou mayest not be hated."—T. L.]

*[This seems exceedingly forced and far-fetched. KNOBEL's view is more so. The simple order of thought may be stated thus: Wise men are scarce, being to the strong men, the שַׁלִּיטִים, captains, or principal men in a city, about as one to ten; but *one*, a truly righteous, or perfectly righteous man, is not found on earth, *etc.* The wise man of ver. 19, is not the pious man necessarily, or the one who fears God, though that may be included, but wise, simply, in distinction from men of power or political eminence, or wise like the one described chap. ix. 15, "who saved the city." Such may be found, but the perfectly righteous is a character that does not exist upon earth. The particle כִּי here is emphatic, calling attention to the fact regarded as strange, and yet well known. See Metrical Version.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

be led astray by this, and do not listen to it; and this out of humility, because you must ever be conscious of your faults, and therefore know sufficiently well what is true in the evil reports of men, and what is not.—**Also take no heed unto all the words that are spoken.** That is, do not cast all to the wind that thou hearest, but only, do not be over anxious about their evil reports concerning thee; do not be curious to hear how they judge thee. We are therefore warned against idle curiosity and latent desire of praise, and reminded of the very significant circumstance that one's own servant may accord to the vain listener disgrace and imprecation, instead of the desired honor.—Ver. 22. **For ofttimes also thine own heart knoweth that thou thyself likewise hast cursed others.** The expression, "thine own heart," is clearly equivalent to the guilty conscience that accuses man of his former sins, especially of his unkindness to his neighbor, and his violations of the eighth commandment, and thereby demands of him a more humble self-appreciation, and a wiser restraint in intercourse with others. פעמים רבות may be considered either as the accusative of time—"many times"—or the objective accusative—"many cases"—but belongs in either case closely to ידע, not to קללת. The first גם is, in strictness, superfluous. אשר at the beginning of the second clause, is not "so that" (Elster), but "there where" ("where it happened that," *etc.*); comp. Gen. xxxv. 13-15; 2 Sam. xix. 25.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

(*With Homiletical Hints.*)

This section has three divisions describing the nature of genuine wisdom in three principal phases:—as an earnestness of life, despising the world, as patience, resigned to God, and as an humble penitent fear of God. Of these, the third affords a rich harvest in the dogmatic field, and mainly by emphasizing one of the most important anthropological truths of the entire Old Testament revelation, namely, the universal sinfulness of the human race (see especially ver. 20, and also the parallel passages there quoted from Psalms, Job and the Proverbs). This truth appears here in a connection which is the more significant because it forms the background, and the deepest motive, to all the preceding admonitions. It explains not only the preceding warning against the two extremes of hypocritical and false righteousness and bold lawlessness, (the cardinal vice of Jew and Gentile before Christ, or the fundamental error of Pharisees and Sadducees among the later Jews); but it also finally serves as a basis and impulse (in the first two strophes) to the admonitions to holy earnestness, and to a calm and resigned state of soul. In the admonition to a stern contempt of the world and its pleasures, this is especially clear; for this admonition closes in verse 7 with the highly impressive reference to the fact, that even wise men are exposed to the seduction of vices and follies of divers kinds, whence directly springs the duty of turning from the busy tumult of the world, and of anxious zeal for one's own salvation in fear and trembling. But the second division (vers. 8-14) also presupposes the fact that men, without exception, lie under the burden of sin; as it declares wisdom [which is unconditional resignation to the divine will] to be the only dispenser of true life (ver. 12) and describes, as the salutary fruit of such wisdom, the patient endurance of the evil as well as the good days which God sends. It needs no further illustration to prove that this significant attention to the principal anthropological truth of the Old Testament gives to this chapter a peculiarly evangelical character,—especially with the quite numerous parallels in New Testament history. (Comp. Matt. v. 4; Luke vi. 25; James v. 9, *etc.*, with vers. 3, 4, 6; and 2 Cor. vii. 10 with ver. 3; James v. 7, 8 with ver. 8; James i. 19 with ver. 9; Matt. xxiii. 5 ff. with ver. 16 ff.; Matt. xxiii. 23 with ver. 18; Rom. iii. 23 with ver. 20).

We may regard the following as the leading proposition of the entire section: *The universality of human sin and the only true remedy for it.* Or, God withstands the arrogant and grants His favor to the humble; or, "Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted; Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth; Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled" (Matt. v. 4-6, three beatitudes of the sermon on the mount, corresponding to the three divisions of this chapter).—Comp. also Starke. Two rules for Christian conduct: 1. Be ever mindful of death (1-7); 2. Be patient and contented (8-29).

HOMILETICAL HINTS ON SEPARATE PASSAGES.

Ver. 1. Cramer:—Faith, a good conscience, and a good name, are three precious jewels; we can get nothing better than these from this world.—Starke:—The death of the saints is the completion of their struggle against sin, the devil and the world; it is to them a door of life, an entrance into eternal rest and perfect security.—Hengstenberg:—The difference between the proposition in the latter clause of the first verse, and similar expressions in the Gentile world, is that the Gentiles did not possess the key to explanation of human sorrows on earth, and did not understand how to bring them into harmony with divine justice and love.

Ver. 2. Melanchthon:—In prosperity, men become reckless; they think less of God's wrath, and less expect His aid. Thus they become more and more presumptuous; they trust to their own industry, their own power, and are thus easily driven on by the devil.—Tübingen Bible: Joy in the world is the mark of a man drowned in vanity. It is much better to mourn over sin, and, in reflecting on this vanity, to seek a higher joy that is in God.—Starke:—Although not all cheerfulness is forbidden to the Christian (Phil. iv. 4), it is always safer to think with sorrow of one's sin, guilt, and liability to punishment, than to assume a false gladsomeness.—Hengstenberg:—Periods of sorrow are always periods of blessings for the Church.—Deichert: [Sermon on vers. 3-9, in the collection of Old Tes-

Digitized by Google

tament sermons: "The Star out of Jacob, Stuttgard, 1867, p. 208:]" The house of lamentation is a school of humility. 1. In the house of mourning proud thoughts are abased; 2. There, especially, is the vain pleasure of the world recognized in its emptiness; 3. There, also, we learn to prize the end of a thing more highly than its beginning.

Vers. 6 and 7. LUTHER:—The joy of fools seems as if it would last forever, and does indeed blaze up, but it is nothing. They have their consolation for a moment, then comes misfortune, that casts them down: then all their joy lies in the ashes. . . . . Pleasure, and vain consolation of the flesh, do not last long, and all such pleasures turn into sorrow, and have an evil end.—STARKE:—(Ver. 7), Even a wise and God-fearing man is in danger of being turned from the good way (1 Cor. x. 12); therefore watchfulness and prayer are necessary that we may not be carried back again to our evil nature (1 Pet. v. 8).

Ver. 8. MELANCHTHON:—In this saying he demands perseverance in good counsels (Matt. x. 12); for the good cause appears better in the event. Though much that is adverse is to be borne, nevertheless the right and true triumph in the end.—LANGE:—The beginning and the continuance of Christianity are connected with sorrows; but these sorrows are followed by a glorious and blissful end (2 Cor. iv. 17.—BERLEB. BIBLE:—Blessed is he who under all circumstances behaves with quiet patience, arms himself with humble resignation and great cheerfulness, adapts himself to good and evil times, and ever finds strength and pleasure in the words: "Thy will be done!"—HENGSTENBERG:—It is folly to stop at what lies immediately before our eyes; it is wisdom, on the contrary, in the face of the fortune of the wicked, to say: "For they shall soon be cut down like the grass and wither as the green herb." Ps. xxxvii. 2; xcii. 7; cxxix. 6). If we only do not hasten in anger, God in His own time will remove the inducement to anger from our path.

CRAMER:—It proceeds from men alone that time is better at one period than at another; on their account also time must be subjected to vanity.—GEIER:—The best remedy against evil times is to pray zealously, penitently to acknowledge the deserved punishment of sin, patiently to bear it and heartily to trust in God.—WOHLFARTH:—Let us hear the voice of truth! In its light, impartially comparing the present and the past, we shall arrive at the conviction that every period has its peculiar advantages and defects, and that with all the unpleasant features that rest upon our time it nevertheless presents a greater measure of happiness than any former one. Instead, therefore, of embittering the advantages of our epoch by foolish complaints, making its burdens heavier, and weakening our own courage, we should seek rather to become wisely familiar with it, and to remove its defects or make them less perceptible.

Vers. 11-14. STARKE: (Vers. 11 and 12):—If you are to have but one of two things, you should much rather dispense with all riches than with heavenly wisdom, that after this life you may have eternal blessedness (Wisdom vii. 8-10).—CARTWRIGHT (ver. 13):—When a bird is caught in a net, the more he struggles the more tightly is he held. So if a man is taken in the net of Providence, the safest course for him, is to yield himself wholly to the divine will as that which, with the highest good, does nothing unwise or unjust (Job xxxiv. 12).—HENGSTENBERG:—We must be led to contentment in sorrow, by the reflection that it comes from the same God that sends us happiness (Job ii. 10). If the sender is the same, *there must be in the sending, in spite of all external inequality, an essential equality.* God, even when He imposes a cross, is still God, our heavenly Father, our Saviour, who has thoughts of peace regarding us.

Vers. 15-18. LUTHER:—The substance is this: *Summum jus summa injuria.* He who would most rigidly regulate and rectify everything, whether in the State or in the household, will have much labor, little or no fruit. On the other hand, there is one who would do nothing, and who contemns the enforcement of justice. Neither is right. As you would not be over-righteous, see to it that you be not over-wicked,—that is, that you do not contemn and neglect all government committed to you, thus letting everything fall into evil. It may be well to overlook some things, but not to neglect everything. If wisdom does not succeed, you are not, therefore, to get mad with rage and vengeance. Mind that you be just, and others with you, enforce piety, firmly persevere, however it may turn out. You must fear lest He come as suddenly and call you to judgment, as he took away the soul of the rich man in the night he thought not of.—CRAMER, (Ver. 16):—Those rulers are over-just who search everything too closely; and the theologians are over-wise who, in matters of faith, wish to direct everything according to their own reason.—ZEYSS, (ver. 17):—Wickedness itself is already a road to ruin; but where foolish arrogance joins it, so that one boldly sins, divine punishment and vengeance are thereby hastened (Sirach v. 4 ff.).—HENGSTENBERG:—Godly fear escapes the danger of Phariseeism by awakening in the heart an antipathy against deceiving God by the tricks of a heartless and false righteousness; but it also escapes the danger of a life of sin, because the power arising from the confession of sin is inseparably connected with it (Isa. vi. 5); for with the fear of God is connected a tender aversion to offending God by sin (Gen. xxxix. 9) as also the lively desire to walk in the way of His commandments (Ps. cxix. 16.)

Vers. 19-22. ZEYSS, (vers. 19 and 20):—The universal ruin produced by sin must lead every one to heartfelt penitence and humility (Ezra ix. 6.)—STARKE, (vers. 21 and 22):—The wisdom of the Creator has given us two ears and only one tongue, in order to teach us that we must hear twice before we speak once (James i. 19). If anything grieves thee, examine thyself to learn whether thou hast not deserved it by evil conduct; humble thyself concerning it before God, suffer patiently, and do it no more!—HENGSTENBERG:—In times of severe sorrow it is important that, in the suffering, we recognize the deserved punishment for our sins. That brings light into the otherwise obscure providence of God, a light that stills the rising of the soul, that animates the hope. If we recognize the footsteps of God in the deserved sorrow, the confidence in His mercy soon becomes strong.

Digitized by Google

C.—True Wisdom must be Energetically Maintained and Preserved in Presence of all the Attractions, Oppressions, and other Hostilities on the part of this World.

CHAP. VII. 23—VIII. 15.

1. Against the enticements of this world, and especially unchastity.

(CHAP. VII. 23–29).

23 All this have I proved by wisdom: I said, I will be wise; but it *was* far from
24, 25 me. That which is far off, and exceeding deep, who can find it out? I ap-
plied mine heart to know, and to search, and to seek out wisdom, and the reason
of things, and to know the wickedness of folly, even of foolishness *and* madness:
26 And I find more bitter than death the woman whose heart *is* snares and nets, *and*
her hands *as* bands: whoso pleases God shall escape from her; but the sinner shall
27 be taken by her. Behold, this have I found, saith the Preacher, *counting* one by
28 one, to find out the account: Which yet my soul seeketh, but I find not: one man
among a thousand have I found; but a woman among all those have I not found.
29 Lo, this only have I found, that God hath made man upright; but they have
sought out many inventions.

2. Against the temptations to disloyalty and rebellion in national and civil relations.

(CHAP. VIII. 1-8).

1 Who *is* as the wise *man*? and who knoweth the interpretation of a thing? a
man's wisdom maketh his face to shine, and the boldness of his face shall be
2 changed. I *counsel thee* to keep the king's commandment, and *that* in regard
3 of the oath of God. Be not hasty to go out of his sight: stand not in an evil
4 thing; for he doeth whatsoever pleaseth him. Where the word of a king *is there*
5 *is* power: and who may say unto him, What doest thou? Whoso keepeth the
commandment shall feel no evil thing: and a wise man's heart discerneth both
6 time and judgment. Because to every purpose there is time and judgment, there-
7 fore the misery of man *is* great upon him. For he knoweth not that which shall
8 be: for who can tell him when it shall be? *There is* no man that hath power over
the spirit to retain the spirit: neither *hath he* power in the day of death: and *there*
is no discharge in *that* war; neither shall wickedness deliver those that are given
to it.

3. Against the oppressions of tyrants and other injustices.

(VERS. 9-15.)

9 All this have I seen, and applied my heart unto every work that is done under
the sun: *there is* a time wherein one man ruleth over another to his own hurt.
10 And so I saw the wicked buried, who had come and gone from the place of the
holy, and they were forgotten in the city where they had so done: this *is* also
11 vanity. Because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore
12 the heart of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil. Though a sinner do
evil an hundred times, and his *days* be prolonged, yet surely I know that it shall
13 be well with them that fear God, which fear before him: But it shall not be well
with the wicked, neither shall he prolong *his* days, *which are* as a shadow; because
14 he feareth not before God. There is a vanity which is done upon the earth; that

Digitized by Google

there be just *men*, unto whom it happeneth according to the work of the wicked:
again, there be wicked *men*, to whom it happeneth according to the work of the
15 righteous: I said that this also *is* vanity. Then I commended mirth, because a
man hath no better thing under the sun, than to eat, and to drink, and to be
merry: for that shall abide with him of his labour the days of his life, which God
giveth him under the sun.

[VII. 29. לְבַד is not rightly rendered *only*—"this only have I found." More correctly, *this* by *itself*, or *besides*, as something beyond what is said before of both sexes.—T. L.]

[Chap. viii. 1. יְשֻׁנֶּא; there is no need of saying of this that it is *more Chaldæo;* some such interchange of א for ה is quite common in Hebrew—see the extensive list of cases given by the Jewish grammarian, JONA BEN GANNACH. The lxx. read שָׂנֵא to hate. So did the Syriac. עֹז פָּנָיו denotes the sternness, or austerity, of the countenance. Wisdom clears it up, *changes* it to a bright and joyful aspect. See M. V.—T. L.]

[Ver. 2. אֲנִי פִּי־מֶלֶךְ; ZÖCKLER would supply אָמַרְתִּי here. There is hardly need of that—I *a king's mouth;* supply simply the substantive verb, "I *am* a king's mouth—take heed." It is an assertion by the writer of his royal right to give such advice. See M. V.—T. L.]

[Ver. 10. וּבְכֵן. See Exeget.—T. L.]

[Ver. 11. פִּתְגָם. See remarks on the appendix to Introduction, p.33.—T. L.]

[Ver. 15. וְשִׁבַּחְתִּי; the conjunction ו here, has more than the mere copulative force. It denotes *time*, as it frequently does, and also a *reason*. Its mere conjunctive force is seldom alone when it connects sentences: "'*Twas then* I praised joy"—that is, when I took this view of things. אֲשֶׁר = not simply to ὅτι, but to ὡς ὅτι, *how that* there is, *etc.;* and that this יִלְוֶנּוּ will remain, adhere to him.—T. L.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The subdivision of this section into three equal divisions or strophes, is indicated by the introductory remarks on the general contents, which are found in chap. vii. 23-29; chap. viii. 1; and chap. viii. 9. The divisions beginning with these passages are clearly different from each other in contents; chap. vii. 25-29 warns us against voluptuousness; chap. viii. 2-8 against rebellion towards civil authority; chap. viii. 9-15 against injustice. Since this latter theme does not close until the 14th and 15th verses, it seems quite improper to extend the third section simply to ver. 10, as do HENGSTENBERG, HITZIG, *et al.*, [the general introduction of the first part of ver. 14 is, in comparison with vers. 1, 9, and chap. vii. 23-25 too insignificant to be able to serve as the opening of a new division], just as we must declare the separation of ver. 15 from the preceding, as the beginning of an entirely new section, (HAHN) decidedly inexpedient and destructive of the sense.

2. *First Strophe. Introduction.* Chap. vii. 23-25. Concerning the difficulty of finding true wisdom, and Koheleth's zealous search after it.—**All this have I proved with wisdom**.—This, therefore, formed the means and the goal of his searching. For the expression נִסָּה בַחָכְמָה compare on the one hand תּוּר בַּחָכְמָה ch. i. 13, and, on the other, נִסָּה בְשִׂמְחָה, ch. ii. 1. "All this" certainly does not refer to all the preceding from the beginning of the book, as HENGSTENBERG asserts, but mainly to the rules of life and practical counsels contained in chap. vii. 1-22.—**But it was far from me.**—"It," *i. e.*, wisdom in the absolute sense, perfected wisdom. A partial possession of wisdom is by no means excluded by this humble confession of not having found any; see vers. 5, 11-16, 19, *etc.* Ver. 24. **That which is far off**—*i. e.*, the real innermost essence of wisdom lies far from human comprehension; comp. Job xxviii. 12 ff.; Sirach xxiv. 38 ff.; Baruch iii. 14 ff. ROSENMUELLER, HERZFELD, HAHN, ELSTER [and, at an earlier period, also EWALD] correctly consider מַה שֶּׁהָיָה as the subject of the clause; but הָיָה cannot then be taken in the preterit sense, as is done by the three first named commentators [HERZFELD: "that remains far off which was far off;" ROSENMUELLER: *procul abest, quod ante aderat;* HAHN: "that is far off which has been"]. KNOBEL, HITZIG, VAIHINGER, and, lately, EWALD, affirm that there is an emphatic prefixing of the predicate "far" before the relative pronoun מַה: "That which is far off, and exceeding deep, who can find it out." But the examples quoted from chap. i. 9; Job xxiii. 9 scarcely justify so harsh a construction. The interpretation of HENGSTENBERG: "that is far off which has been," *i. e.*, the comprehension of what has been or is (τῶν ὄντων γνῶσις, Wisd. of Sol., vii. 17) is opposed by the circumstance that practical wisdom alone is here considered, and not theoretical,* for which reason also there can

*[The confusion arises here from disregarding the meditative, soliloquizing, exclamatory style of this book,—in a word, its poetical character. These divisions into the *practical* and *theoretical* regard it too much as an abstract ethical or didactic treatise, with its logical and rhetorical arrangement. This is at war with its subjective, emotional aspect, and hence much forced and false interpretations. See the remarks p. 172 in the Introduction to the rhythmical version. The most literal rendering is the best, since it preserves this broken, interjectional, ejaculatory style, in which the writer is giving vent to his emotions at the thought of the great past, and how small human knowledge is in respect to it. He expresses it as he feels it, in fragmentary sighs, and repetitions, or as one who says it over and over to himself without thinking of others, or of any didactic use, and yet in this very way, making the most vivid and practical impression.

O that I might be wise, I said; but it was far from me;
Far off! The past, what is it? Deep—a deep—O who can find?

There is strong emotion in the paragogic or optative form of אֶחְכָּמָה. It expresses the most intense and longing desire, but with little hope of knowing the great secret of the

Digitized by Google

scarcely be a reference to the objective cognition of wisdom, or the knowledge of its objects. The interpretations of most of the ancients are decidedly ungrammatical, as of the Septuagint (μακρὰν ὑπὲρ ὃ ἦν), Vulgate (*multo magis quam erat*), LUTHER ("It is far off, what will it be?"); thus also is that of KÖSTER ("It is far off, what is that"), and so many others.—**And exceeding deep.**—Lit., "*deep, deep.*" The repetition of עָמֹק expresses the superlative idea (EWALD, *Lehrbuch*, § 303 c). Deep signifies difficult to be fathomed, comp. Prov. xx. 5, and especially Job xi. 8, where the Divine doing and the Divine government are declared to be the absolute limit of all wisdom, or as "deeper than hell;" see also Ps. cxxxix. 8; Rom. xi. 33. Ver. 25. **I applied mine heart.**—Lit., "I turned, I and my heart,"—a figure similar to that in Acts xv. 28: ἔδοξεν τῷ πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ ἡμῖν; comp. also the Song of Solomon v. 2. That the heart also participated in the turning, shows it to be no thoughtless action, but one resting on deep reflection. The simple סַבּוֹתִי does not express a return from a path formerly followed, but now perceived to be an erroneous one (HITZIG's view). It is different with וְסַבּוֹתִי, "then I turned," chap. ii. 20, which clearly marks the entrance into a path entirely new, whilst in this passage nothing is affirmed but the transition from a superficial to a deeper and more solicitous searching after wisdom. Comp. HENGSTENBERG and VAIHINGER on this passage, which latter correctly gives the connection thus: "Although wisdom in its fullness is unsearchable and unattainable, I did not refrain from searching after an insight into the relations of things, in order to learn the causes of the want of moral perfection; I wished, however, in learning wisdom, to learn also its counterpart, and thus to see that iniquity is every where folly."—**To know, and to search, and to seek out wisdom,** *etc.*—The two accusatives, wisdom and reason, belong only to the last of the three infinitives (בַּקֵּשׁ), before which לְ is left out, in order to separate it externally from the two preceding ones. חֶשְׁבּוֹן is here, as in ver. 27, "reason, calculation," a result of the activity of the judgment in examining and judging of the relations of practical life, therefore equivalent to insight, practical sagacity and knowledge of life. VAIHINGER's interpretation of חָכְמָה וְחֶשְׁבּוֹן in the sense of "wisdom as calculation," is unnecessary, and indeed in direct contradiction to the construction in the following clause. The copula also in viii. 2 does not express the explanatory sense of the expression, "and indeed."—**And to know the wickedness of folly, and even of foolishness and madness.**—(ZÖCKLER: "wickedness as folly, foolishness as madness"). That this is to be thus translated is proved by the absence of the article * before the second accusative. Comp.

long past, much less of the far stretching future. The interjections used in rendering really inhere in the style. What should we think of an attempt to lay off YOUNG's *Night Thoughts* in "strophes of the practical and the theoretical?" And yet it is fully as capable of such divisions as this most emotional poem of Koheleth. In the Hebrew, רָחוֹק is accentually joined with מַה שֶּׁהָיָה, but it is rhythmical rather than logical, and would not prevent מַה from being an interrogative pronoun: מַה אשר היה, "what—that which was?" or, "that which was, what is it?" As though he had been going to say merely, "far off the past," but the emotion throws it into the more broken or exclamatory utterance, and then he adds: "and deep—deep—*who* can find it?" The מִי as personal interrogative, corresponds to the general interrogative מָה.

In the expression, "*O let me be wise,*" we have at once suggested to us the passage 1 Kings iii. 5–14, Solomon's dream at Gibeon, the Lord's appearing unto him, and his earnest prayer for a לֵב חָכָם "a wise and understanding heart." With all his errors the *love of wisdom* (φιλοσοφία and θεοσοφία) had been a passion from his earliest youth,—wisdom speculative as well as practical,—wisdom not only "to govern so great a people," and to "discern," ethically, "between good and evil," but to understand, if it were possible, the ways of God, and the great problem of humanity. Rightly considered, this strong desire, thus expressed, is a special mark of the Solomonic authorship. "O let me be wise, *I said.*" He said it in his dream at Gibeon.

"*Deep—deep—O who shall find it!*" Like other passages of Scripture, this is capable of an ever expanding sense. We may think of the earthly past, so much of it historically unknown; but the style of thought in Koheleth carries the mind still farther back to the great past "before the earth was" (Prov. viii. 23),—to the עוֹלְמֵי עֹלָמִים πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων, 1 Cor. ii. 7, "before the ages of ages," or worlds of worlds. There are two views here that may be pronounced exceeding narrow. The one is that of the Scriptural interpreter who recognizes no higher chronology to the whole universe than a few thousand of our sun-measured years. To this he adds six solar days, and then slides off into a blank antepast eternity, a chronological nothingness, we may say, where Deity dwelt, had ever dwelt, ἄχρονος, without time, without creative manifestation—all worlds, whether of space or time, and all ranks of existence below the Divine, having had their origination in this single week (as measured by earthly revolutions) that he assigns to them. The other view, still more narrow—for it is an infinite narrowness—is the one held by some modern thinkers of high repute. It is that of an eternal physical development, or evolution, carried on through an infinite past of duration, ever evolving *progressively*, and yet with nothing more or higher evolved, ever evolved, than the very finite and imperfect state of things we now behold,—man the highest product of this eternal evolution that has ever been reached in any part of the universe,—man as yet the "*etre supreme,*"—man, too, *lately* evolved, or within a few thousand years, from some of the animal classes just below him. All before is a descending inclined plane, with an uninterrupted evenness, and an infinitesimal angle, falling away lower and still lower forevermore, in the infinite retrocession from the present advanced state of things!!

In contradistinction to the meagre poverty of both these views stands the Scriptural *malkuth kol olamim* (Ps. cxlv. 13) βασιλεια τῶν αἰώνων (1 Tim. i. 17)—*a kingdom of all eternities*, with its ages of ages, its worlds of worlds, its ascending orders of being, its mighty dispensations embracing all grades of evolution in the physical, and an unimaginable variety in the holy administrations of Him who styles Himself Jehovah tsebaoth, the Lord of *hosts*. This alone leaves the mind *free* in its speculative roamings, allowing it to compete with any philosophy in this respect, whilst *binding* it ever to an adoring recognition of the one absolute and infinite personality, "according to whose will all things are, and were, created."

The Targum explains מָה שֶׁהָיָה here of the great unknown past, regarding it as equally mysterious with the secrets of the unknown future: "It is too far off for the sons of men to know that which was from the *days of eternity.*" RASHI and ABEN EZRA give substantially the same interpretation, with a like reference to the creation and the creative times: "What is above, what is below, what is before, what is after,—it is deep, deep, too deep for our power to think." The impassioned impressiveness of Koheleth's language amply justifies such a style of interpretation.—T. L.]

*[ZÖCKLER's rendering, "wickedness as folly, foolishness as madness," weakens the sense. It is more impassioned without the conjunctions, or any other particles to break its earnest and hurried style: "wickedness, presumption [stubbornness, as כֶּסֶל may mean], yea, stupidity, madness," all given in a running list:

To seek out wisdom, reason,—sin to know—
Presumption, folly, vain impiety.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

for this construction EWALD, § 284 b, and for the sentence, i. 17; ii. 12 f.; x. 13.

3. *First Strophe. Continuation and Conclusion.* Vers. 26-29. A warning concerning an unchaste woman and her seductive arts. HENGSTENBERG, following older writers [and thus SEB. SCHMID, MICHAEL., LAMPE, J. LANGE, STARKE, *etc.*) maintains that this harlot is an ideal personage, the false wisdom of the heathen; but that she is a representative of the female sex in general in its worst aspect, appears to be incontrovertible from vers. 28 and 29, where women in general are represented as the more corrupt portion of humanity, corresponding with Sirach xxv. 24; 1 Tim. ii. 12-15. And as parallels to this passage we find above all those warnings of the Proverbs of Solomon against the "harlot" or "strange woman," *i. e.*, against unchaste intercourse with women in general; comp. Prov. ii. 16 ff.; v. 2 ff.; vii. 5 ff.; xxii. 14; xxiii. 27. And quite as arbitrary as the idealizing of this lascivious woman into the abstract idea of "false wisdom," is the view of HITZIG, namely, that therein allusion is made to a definite historical person, Agathoclea, mistress of Ptolemy Philopater.—**And I find more bitter than death.**—For this figure comp. 1 Sam. xv. 32; Sirach xxviii. 25; xli. 1; also Prov. v. 4, *etc.*—**The woman whose heart is snares and nets.**—אֲשֶׁר is to be connected with the suffix in לִבָּהּ and הִיא is to be regarded as copula between subject and predicate, which here emphatically precedes. In the comparison of the heart of the harlot to "snares and nets," and her hands to "bands," we naturally think, in the first instance, of her words and looks (as expressions of the thoughts of her heart), and, in the second, of voluptuous embraces.—**Whoso pleaseth God shall escape from her.**—Lit. "He who is good in the sight of God." Comp. ii. 26. The meaning is here as there, the God-fearing and just man, the contrary of חוֹטֵא or sinner, who by her (בָּהּ) *i. e.*, by the nets and snares of her heart, and by her loose seductive arts, is caught. Ver. 27. **Behold, this have I found, saith the Preacher.**—Notwithstanding chap. i. 1; ii. 12; xii. 9, where קֹהֶלֶת is without the article, we must still read here אָמַר הַקֹּהֶלֶת (comp. xii. 8) and not אָמְרָה קֹהֶלֶת; for the word קֹהֶלֶת is every where else used as masculine, and the author cannot wish to express a significant contrast between the preaching wisdom and the amorous woman, since the expression, "saith the Preacher," is here, as in those other passages, a mere introductory formula (though HENGSTENBERG thinks otherwise).—**Counting one by one**—namely, considering, reflecting. Lit., "one to the other," *i. e.*, adding, arranging. The words are adverbially used, as in the phrase פָּנִים אֶל פָּנִים Gen. xxxii. 31.—**To find out the account.**—[חֶשְׁבּוֹן as in ver. 25], giving the result of this action of arranging one after the other. This did not consist in comparison between woman and death, but in a summing up of those unfavorable observations concerning her which necessitates the final judgment, namely, that she is "more bitter than death." The whole verse clearly refers to the foregoing, and does not, therefore, serve as an introduction to the contents of vers. 28, 29, as HAHN and several older authors contend, who begin a new section with this verse. There is rather a certain break immediately before ver. 28, as the words אֲשֶׁר עוֹד בִּקְשָׁה וְגוֹ at the beginning of this verse show. Ver. 28. **Which yet my soul seeketh.**—The soul is represented as seeking, to indicate how much this seeking was a matter of the heart to the preacher; comp. the address: "thou whom my soul loveth," Song of Sol. i. 17; iii. 1 ff. The "finding not" is then again attributed to the first person: "and that which I found not."—**One man among a thousand have I found**—*i. e.*, among a thousand of the human race, I found, indeed, one righteous one, one worthy of the name of man, and corresponding to the idea of humanity. אָדָם here stands for אִישׁ as, in the Greek, ἄνθρωπος for ἀνήρ. For the expression "one among a thousand" [lit., out of a thousand] comp. Job ix. 3; xxxiii. 23; but for the sentence, ver. 20 above, and Job xiv. 5; Micah vii. 2, *etc.* The hereditary corruption of the entire human race is here as much presupposed as in the parallel passages; for Koheleth will hardly recognize the one righteous man that he found among a thousand as absolutely righteous, and therefore as אָדָם in the primeval, pure and ideal sense of the first man before the fall.—**But a woman among all these have I not found.** That is, one worthy of the name אִשָּׁה, in the primeval ideal sense of Gen. ii. 22-25, I did not find among all that thousand, which presented me at least one proper man. That he never found such a one, consequently that he considered the whole female sex as vicious and highly corrupt, cannot possibly be his opinion, as appears from ver. 29, as also in chap. ix. 9. (See the praise of noble women in other documents of the Chokmah literature, as Prov. v. 19; xviii. 22; xxxi. 10 f.; Ps. cxxviii. ff.). But that moral excellence among women, taken as a whole, is much more rarely found than among men, that sin reigns more uncontrolled among the former than the latter, and in the form of moral weakness and proneness to temptation, as well as in the inclination to seduce, to deceive and ensnare—such is clearly the sense of this passage, a sense that harmonizes with Gen. iii. 16; Sirach xxv. 24; 2 Cor. xi. 3; 1 Tim. ii. 12 ff., as also with numerous other extra-biblical passages. Comp. also these sentences from the Talmud: "It is better to follow a lion than a woman;"—"Who follows the counsel of his wife arrives at hell;"—"The mind of women is frivolous;" also the Greek maxims: θάλασσα καὶ πῦρ καὶ γυνὴ κακὰ τρία;—ὅπου γυναῖκες εἰσι πάντ' ἐκεῖ κακά. Compare also the following Proverb from the Arabic of MEIDANI; "Women are the snares of Satan," *etc.* (Comp. WOHLFARTH, KNOBEL and VAIHINGER on this passage).—Ver. 29. **Lo, this only have I found.** לְבַד, "alone, only" (an adverb as in Isa. xxvi. 18), here serving to introduce a re-

Digitized by Google

mark intended as a restriction of what precedes.* The fact of the universal sinful corruption of man, expressed indirectly in ver. 28, is here to be so far restricted that this corruption is not to be considered as innate in humanity through a divine agency, but as brought into the world by man's own guilt.—**That God hath made man upright.** יָשָׁר, upright, good, *integer;* comp. Gen. i. 26 f.; v. 1; ix. 6; Wisdom ii. 23.—**But they have sought out many inventions.** הִשְּׁבֹנוֹת are not "useless subtleties," (EWALD), but, as the contrast to the idea of יָשָׁר teaches us: *malæ artes*, tricks, evil artifices, conceits.

4. *Second strophe, Introduction*, chap. viii. 1.—Of the rarity and preciousness of wisdom.—**Who is as the wise man?** This is no triumphant question, induced, or occasioned by that lucky finding in the last verse of the preceding chapter (HITZIG), but simply an introduction to what follows, by which true wisdom is to be declared a rare treasure of difficult attainment, just as in chap. vii. 23; viii. 16 f.—In כְּהֶחָכָם, the usually contracted form כֶּחָכָם is again expanded, in accordance with a custom often occurring in later authors;† comp. Ezek. xl. 25; xlvii. 22; 2 Chron. x. 7; xxv. 10, *etc.*—**And who knoweth the interpretation of a thing;** ZÖCKLER, "of the word," (דָּבָר)‡ namely, of the following assertion, which emphasizes the great work of wisdom according to its influence on the physical well-being and morally just demeanor of men. פֵּשֶׁר, a Chaldaic word§ (comp. Dan. ii. 4 ff., 24 ff.; iv. 6, 15), holding the same relation to the synonymous פִּתְרוֹן as יֹתֵר to יִתְרוֹן.—**A man's wisdom maketh his face to shine.** That is, it imparts to him a cheerful soul, and this on account of the fortunate and satisfactory relations into which it places him. The same figure is found in Numb. vi. 25; Ps. iv. 7; Job xxix. 24.—**And the boldness of his face shall be changed.** עֹז פָּנָיו is to be explained without doubt according to expressions הֵעֵז פָּנִים, Prov. vii. 13; xxi. 29; or עַז־פָּנִים Deut. xxviii. 50; Dan. viii. 23, and signifies, therefore, that repulsive harshness and stiffness of the features which are a necessary result of a coarse, unamiable, and selfish heart (not exactly "boldness," as DÖDERLEIN, DE WETTE, and GESENIUS translate, or "displeasure," as KNOBEL, GRIMM, and VAIHINGER). It is therefore the civilizing, softening and morally refining influence of true wisdom on the soul of man, that the author has in view, and which, according to the question in the beginning of the verse, he describes as something mysterious and in need of explanation, and which he explains, partly at least, by the subsequent precepts regarding wise conduct in a civil sphere. EWALD's comprehension of the passage is in sense not materially different from ours: "And the brightness of his countenance is doubled"—but this is in opposition to the usual signification of עֹז as well as that of שָׁנָה, which can hardly be rendered "to double." The explanations of the *Septuagint*, resting on a different punctuation, יְשֻׂנָּא instead of יְשֻׁנֶּא give a widely different sense ἀναιδὴς προσώπῳ αὐτοῦ μισηθήσεται, which gave rise to that of LUTHER: "But he who is bold, is malignant;" and HITZIG, in conjunction with ZIRKEL (and the *Vulgate*) reads יְשַׁנֵּא and thus obtains the sense, "and boldness disfigureth the countenance." But the word עֹז alone hardly means "boldness," and the change adopted in the punctuation appears the more unnecessary since the sense resulting from it brings the assertion in the last clause into contrast with the one before it, which is in decided opposition to the connection.

5. *Second strophe. Continuation.* Vers. 2-4. A proper demeanor towards kings the first means of realizing true wisdom.—**I counsel thee to keep the king's commandment.** To אֲנִי supply אָמַרְתִּי or אֹמֵר, a somewhat harsh ellipse,* for which however we may quote parallels in Isa. v. 9; Jer. xx. 10, and elsewhere. Therefore it is unnecessary, with HITZIG, to punctuate שֹׁמֵר "I keep the king's commandment" (thus the *Vulgate*). That שׁוֹמֵר stands in ver. 5 below in *scriptio plena* would form no valid objection against the allowableness of this change of the imperative into the participle; for שֹׁמֵר is also found in chap. xi. 4. But, as ELSTER correctly observes: "it would be surprising if Koheleth did not appear here in his usual manner as a teacher who admonishes others, but only as announcing what he has laid down as a principle to himself." "To regard the mouth of the king" means of course, to render obedience to his commands; comp. Gen. xlv. 21; Ex. xvii. 1; Job xxxix. 27, *etc.*—**And that in regard of the oath of God**, which thou hast vowed to him, the King. The duty of obedience to worldly authority is here insisted on with reference to loyalty towards God, the heavenly witness to the vow made to the king; comp. Matt. xxii. 21; Rom. xiii. 1-7; 1 Pet.

*[See text note on לְבַד.—T. L.]

†[This is undoubtedly meant as proof of the late authorship of Koheleth, but it amounts to no more than this, namely, that the old manuscript of Ecclesiastes, whose copies have come down to us, was made by a scribe writing from the ear as another read aloud, in consequence of which he has sometimes given in full a letter known to exist etymologically, though lost in sound, as in this case; whilst, on the other hand, and more frequently, he has given it as abbreviated in sound, like שֶׁ for אֲשֶׁר, or אִלּוּ for אִם לוּ, though generally written in the full old etymological form; and again, in other cases, he has written a like sounding letter in place of the true one, as שִׂכְלוּת for סִכְלוּת, and other similar cases. The same remark is applicable to Ezekiel, and the very instances that ZÖCKLER quotes. They are evidences of late chirography in manuscripts, but are little to be relied on as proofs, or disproofs, of original authorship.—T. L.]

‡[This would require the article, or the demonstrative pronoun, or both: הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה.—T. L.]

§[No more Chaldaic than it is Hebrew. It is merely a variation of orthography for the like sounding word פָּתַר, Gen. xl. 8. Who knows how early the change to the sibilant took place? as there are no other examples of either form between Moses and Solomon, or between Solomon and Daniel?—T. L.]

*[See text note.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

ii. 13-17. These New Testament parallels should have prevented HENGSTENBERG from endeavoring to cause the "king" to mean the heavenly King Jehovah, because nominally, "the obedience to the heathen lords of the O. T. in general was not enjoined as a religious duty,"—a remark that is in direct contradiction with passages like Prov. xvi. 10-15; Isa. xlv. 1 ff.; Jer. xxvii. 12, 13; xxix. 5-7; Ezek. xvii. 12 ff. The conjunction וְ in וְעַל is not "and indeed," but "also," adding the remembrance of the assumed oath as an additional motive to the one already contained in the precept. The "oath of God" is an oath made with an appeal to God as witness (Ex. xxii. 10; 2 Sam. xxi. 7; 1 Kings ii. 43), and here especially such an oath of fidelity to the sovereign, sworn in the presence of God (comp. 2 Kings xi. 17; Ezek. xvii. 12 ff.).—Ver. 3. **Be not hasty to go out of his sight.** The first verb only serves to express an adverbial qualification of the second. The hasty going out from the king is not to indicate an apostacy from him, or a share in rebellious movements (KNOBEL, VAIHINGER), but simply the timid or unsatisfactory withdrawal from his presence, in case he is unfavorably inclined; it is directly the opposite of the "standing" forbidden in the subsequent clause. HITZIG's opinion, that the king is considered as an unclean heathen, and that the aim of the entire admonition is to counsel against the too strict observance of the Levitical laws of cleanliness in presence of heathen princes, has too little connection with the context, and is in every respect too artificial.—**Stand not in an evil thing,** (*Ger.*, "evil word"); *i. e.*, when the king speaks an angry word (דָּבָר רָע) do not excite his anger still more by foolishly standing still, as if thou couldst by obstinately remaining in thy place compel his favor. EWALD and ELSTER correctly give the general sense of the admonition as follows: In presence of a king, it is proper to appear modest and yet firm, to show ourselves neither over timid nor obstinate towards him. The *Vulgate*, LUTHER, STARKE, *etc.*, are less consistent: "Stand not in an evil thing," *i. e.*, remain not in evil designs against the king, if you have become involved in such;—HENGSTENBERG gives the same. VAIHINGER: "Do not appear in an evil thing." And thus finally HITZIG: "Stand not at an evil command" [*i. e.*, even though the king should command an evil thing, thou must do it, as DOEG, 1 Sam. xxii. 18], a translation which rests on the erroneous supposition that the author presents as speaking, in vers. 2-4, an opponent of his teachings, a defender of a base worldly expediency and a false servility.—**For he doeth whatever pleaseth him.** This formula serves in other places to show the uncontrolled power of God as ruler of the world (Jon. i. 14; Job xxiii. 13) but must here be necessarily accepted in a relative sense, as an emphatic warning against the fearful wrath of a monarch who is all-powerful, at least in his own realm; comp. Prov. xvi. 14; xix. 12; xx. 2.—Ver. 4 completes the last clause of ver. 3.—**Where the word of a king is there is power.** שִׁלְטוֹן here, and in ver. 8, need not be considered as an adjective; it can quite as easily express the substantive sense of "ruler, commander," as in Dan. iii. 2, 3 (Chaldaic).—**And who may say to him, What doest thou?** That is, who can utter an objection to his ordinances and commands? An expression like that at the close of the preceding verse, which is elsewhere only used in glorification of *divine* power (Job ix. 12; Isa. xlv. 9; Dan. iv. 32; Wisdom xii. 12), but which therefore justifies neither HENGSTENBERG's nor HAHN's reference of the passage to God as the heavenly King, according to HITZIG's assertion: "We have here the servility of an opponent of the king, introduced by the author as speaking in a style which usually indicates the omnipotence of God."

6. *Second Strophe. Conclusion.* Vers. 5-8. Admonition to submit to the existing arrangements of this life, all of which have God as their final author.—**Whoso keepeth the commandment shall feel no evil thing.**—מִצְוָה "the commandment," is undoubtedly the same as דְּבַר־מֶלֶךְ, ver. 4, therefore not the Divine law (VAIHINGER, HAHN, HENGSTENBERG, *etc.*), but the law of earthly authority as the Divine representative. The feeling no evil thing (לֹא יֵדַע דָּבָר רָע) most probably signifies the remaining distant from evil counsels, taking no part in rebellious enterprises (KNOBEL, VAIHINGER, *etc.*), so that, therefore, דבר רע here expresses a sense different from that in verse 3 above. Yet another explanation of the language, and one consistent with the context, is as follows: "He experiences no misfortune, remains protected from the punishment of transgressing the laws" (ELSTER, HENGSTENBERG). But HEILIGSTEDT, on the contrary, is wrong (comp. EWALD): "he pays no attention to the evil that is done to him, and does not grieve about the injustice that he suffers, but bears it with equanimity;" and also HITZIG: "the keeper of the commandment (the servile slave of tyrants) does not first consider an evil command of his superior, in so far as it is morally evil, but executes it blindly, and thus commits a sin at the bidding of a higher power; the wise man, on the contrary, *etc.*"—a declaration which stands and falls with the previously quoted artificial understanding of ver. 2-4 as antagonistic in speech.*—**And a wise man's heart discerneth both time and judgment.**—That is, the wise man knows that for every evil attempt there comes a time of judgment; see ver. 6. This explanation alone, which is that of the Septuagint [*καὶ καιρὸν κρισέως γινώσκει*

*[Among all these conflicting interpretations, it may be suggested that the best way is to take ver. 5 as a qualification of the positiveness and strictness of the previous precepts: The ordinary man who simply yields literal and passive obedience, will be safe in so doing; but the wise man will use his wisdom in judging as to the manner of doing the command, or of modifying, avoiding, or, it may be, of resisting, as Daniel did. This mode of qualifying, or partially retracting, a precept that seems general and exclusive, is not uncommon with Koheleth. Comp. ix. 11 and *al.* Such is in general the idea of STUART, especially as to the last clause, though he interprets לֹא יֵדַע in the first, as meaning, "he (who obeys) will have no concern about the evil command;" that is, will not trouble himself about its rectitude. —T. L.]

Digitized by Google

καρδία σοφοῦ] is in accordance with the text; one needs think as little of the judgment which awaits all men, especially wicked princes and tyrants, as of the appointed time of existence of all civil ordinances [ELSTER], or of the proper time and authority to do any thing, or not (HAHN). Ver. 6. For the first clause compare chap. iii. 17.—**Therefore the misery of man is great upon him.**—That is, on him who unwisely disregards the important truth that there is a time and judgment for every purpose, and therefore takes part in rebellious undertakings against the king; a heavy misfortune visits him as a well-deserved punishment, and he falls a victim of his foolish effort to struggle against the Divinely sanctioned ordinances of this world.* Ver. 7. **For he knoweth not that which shall be.**—He knows not the issue of the undertakings in which he has thoughtlessly allowed himself to be involved; and because the future is veiled to us men, he cannot see what consequences they may have, and how weighty may be the destinies that it entails upon him.—**For who can tell him when it shall be?**—(Ger., "how it shall be").—Therefore he is not only ignorant of future destinies in themselves, but does not even know their "how," the manner of their entrance. HERZFELD and HITZIG say: "When it shall be," *etc.* But כַּאֲשֶׁר no where else in this book signifies "when," not even in iv. 17; v. 4, where it is to be taken as conditional; and the idea of time is by no means in harmony with the passage. Ver. 8. **There is no man that hath power over the spirit to retain the spirit.**—רוּחַ here is different from that in chap. xi. 4 and 5,† where it clearly signifies "wind" (comp. Prov. xxx. 4); it must here be taken in a sense very usual in the O. T., that of "breath of life," "spirit;" comp. iii. 19-21.‡ The meaning of the following clause is most nearly allied to this, and that we find בָּרוּחַ and not בְּרוּחוֹ proves nothing in favor of the contrary acceptation of HITZIG, HAHN, *etc.;* for the author denies the ability of men to control the breath of life, and purposely in the most general way, in order to show, in the strongest manner, his unconditional dependence on God [just as in the following clause he has the very general בְּיוֹם הַמָּוֶת and not בְּיוֹם מוֹתוֹ].—**And there is no discharge in that war.**—That is, as little as the law of war, with its inexorable severity, grants a furlough to the soldier before the battle, just so little can a man escape the law of death which weighs on all, and just so unconditionally must he follow when God calls him hence by death.—**Neither shall wickedness deliver those that are given to it.**—Lit., "its possessors;" comp. vii. 12; and for the sentence, Prov. x. 2; xi. 4, *etc.* This clause clearly contains the principal thought of the verse, as prepared by the three preceding clauses, and which here makes an impressive conclusion of the whole admonition begun in verse 2 concerning disobedience and disloyalty towards authority.

Ver. 7. *Third Strophe. First half.* Vers. 9-13. The many iniquities, oppressions and injustices that occur among men, often remain a long time unpunished, but find, at last, their proper reward, as a proof that God rules and judges justly.—**All this have I seen.**—A transition formula, serving as an introduction to what follows, as in chap. vii. 23. "To see" is here equivalent to observing through experience, and "all this" refers, in the first place, to ver. 5-8, and then to every thing from chap. vii. 23 onward.—**And applied my heart unto every work.**—For נָתַן אֶת־לֵב comp. i. 13.—The infinitive absolute with copula prefixed indicates an action contemporaneous with the main verb. For what follows comp. i. 14; ii. 17; iv. 3, *etc.*—**There is a time when one man rules over another to his own hurt.**—These words clearly form an explanation to what precedes: "every work that is done under the sun;" and they therefore more closely designate the object of the author's observation to be a *whole epoch or series of oppressions of men by tyrants.*—The words are usually regarded as an independent sentence: "There is a time wherein," *etc.;* or, "sometimes," or, "at times," "a man rules," *etc.* (Vulgate, LUTHER, VAIHINGER, HENGSTENBERG, *etc.*). But the word עֵת alone is not equivalent to "there is a time," or "sometimes;" and to refer the pronoun in לוֹ to the first אָדָם (to his own hurt," *i. e.*, to the hurt of the tyrant) is not in harmony with what follows. Also KNOBEL's explanation: "truly I have also seen tyrants who practiced evil unpunished through whole eras," seems quite unfitting, because it anticipates ver. 10, and introduces into the text the word "truly" that is in no wise indicated.—Ver. 10. **And so I saw the wicked buried, who had come and gone** (to rest).—וּבְכֵן lit.: and under such circumstances,* comp. Esth. iv. 16. The wicked, of whom it is here affirmed that they were buried and went to rest, *i. e.*, they received a distinguished and honorable burial [comp. Isa. xiv. 19; Jer. xxii. 19; and also Ec-

*[We cannot help regarding this as a forcing the text into the support of the extreme monarchical doctrine of passive obedience, notwithstanding the qualification adverted to in the previous note. There is, too, an omission, unusual for ZÖCKLER, of all comment on the first part of ver. 6, which contains not only the connection with what precedes, but furnishes the key to what follows. "The heart of the wise man will acknowledge time and reason" (ver. 5): "for there *is* time and reason to every thing, *although* the misery of man (the oppression, the evil rule, under which he suffers) be so great upon him" [עָלָיו implying something laid *upon* him like a heavy burden). It is all made clear by rendering the second כִּי *although*, as adversative to the first—a frequent sense of the particle in this book, as is generally shown by the context. It is a strong and passionate assertion: The world is not all confusion; there *is* time and reason; they will appear at last, though misery so abounds; therefore be patient; watch and wait. Obedience is indeed inculcated to lawful (not merely monarchical) authority, but it is also intimated that it is not to be wholly passive, unreasoning, and blind.—T. L.]

†[There is precisely the same argument for rendering it spirit in chap. xi. 5 (the way of the spirit), as exists for it here. See excursus on that passage, p. 147.—T. L.]

‡[Perhaps there is nothing that shows the *unspirituality* of some commentators more than their obstinate determination to render רוּחַ wind, and often in utter defiance of the context, as in Gen. i. 2, and in such places as these.—T. L.]

*[וּבְכֵן is the particle of illustration: "and in such a case," or, taken in the connection: "and so it was." See the Metrical Version—

'Twas when I saw the wicked dead interred.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

cles. chap. vi. 3] are the same as those named in ver. 9, who rule over others to their hurt, and are therefore tyrannical oppressors and violent rulers. בָּאוּ lit.: "they entered in," namely, to rest, an abbreviation of the full form which is found in Isa. lvii. 2.—**Gone from the place of the holy.**—[ZÖCKLER: But went far from the place of the holy.]—The wicked are clearly here no longer the subject, but as in the following clause, "those who did righteously," whose undeservedly sad fate the author well depicts in contrast with that of the former. Therefore the "place of the holy" from which they wandered afar [מִן, as in Isa. xxvi. 14; Zeph. iii. 18; Job xxviii. 4] is the grave, the honorable burial place which these just ones must fail to obtain; to refer this expression to Jerusalem (HITZIG), or to the sacred courts of the leaders of the people (KNOBEL), or to the community of the saints (HENGSTENBERG), is all arbitrary, and opposed to the context. יְהַלֵּכוּ, "they wandered, they went," does not, of course, mean a wandering of the souls of the unburied after death, but simply [in contrast to that word בָּאוּ] the wandering or being carried to another resting place than that holy place," the burial in a grave neither sacred nor honorable. HITZIG's emendation, יְהַלֵּכוּ, "they pass away," is as unnecessary as the view of EWALD, ELSTER, VAIHINGER, *etc.*, that the Piel הִלֵּךְ is here synonymous with the Hiphil הוֹלִיךְ as though the sense were "I saw them *driven away, cast out* from the holy place."*—**And they were forgotten in the city where they had so done** (ZÖCKLER: "who there justly acted).—For עָשָׂה כֵּן "to do right," to act uprightly, comp. 2 Kings vii. 9: for "being forgotten in the city," *i. e.*, in their own place of residence [not in Jerusalem, as HITZIG declares], Comp. vi. 4; Prov. x. 7; Ps. lxxiii. 19, 20. Instead of וְיִשְׁתַּכְּחוּ the Septuagint, Vulgate, and twenty-three manuscripts had וְיִשְׁתַּבְּחוּ "and they were praised;" but this reading appears clearly to be an emendation, and would render necessary this grammatically inadmissible translation: "and they were praised in the city, *as if they had acted justly*."—**This is also vanity.**—That is, also this unequal distribution of destiny in human life, is an example of the vanity pervading and controlling all earthly relations; comp. ii. 26; iv. 14, 16; vii. 6, *etc.*—Ver. 11. **Because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily.**—Because speedy justice is not executed—a very common reason for the increase of crime and wickedness. פִּתְגָם * originally a Persian word [ancient Persian, *patigama*, modern Per. *paigam*, Armenian *patkam*]; lit., "something that has happened or taken place," and, therefore, command, edict, sentence; comp. Esther i. 20. Since in this passage, as in the Chaldaic sections of Ezra and Daniel (*e. g.*, Ez. iv. 17; Dan. iii. 16; iv. 14), the word is always treated as masculine, we should have expected נַעֲשֶׂה instead of נַעֲשָׂה. But comp. the examples of the masculine quoted by EWALD, § 74, gr., which, in later authors, are used as feminine.—**Therefore the heart of the sons of men is fully set in him to do evil.**—Therefore they venture on evil without any hesitation; comp. ix. 8; Esther vii. 5; Matt. xv. 19.—Vers. 12 and 13. In spite of the universal and ever-increasing prevalence of evil over justice and righteousness, hitherto depicted, the wicked at last find their deserved reward, and oppressed innocence does not perish.—**Though a sinner do evil a hundred times.**—אֲשֶׁר does not here signify "because" (HITZIG), but "*although*," "considering that," as כִּי does sometimes (Lat. *quod si*). Comp. Lev. iv. 22; Deut. xi. 27; xviii. 22; EWALD, § 362, *b*. Before מְאַת supply פְּעָמִים.—**And his days be prolonged**—namely, in sinning. לוֹ with מַאֲרִיךְ shows that this verb is

*[ZÖCKLER's version here, which is substantially that of HITZIG, and even of GEIER, seems very forced. How is he to get the sense of "wandering far," or of "being driven away," from יְהַלֵּכוּ? Then, again, the rendering אֲשֶׁר כֵּן עָשׂוּ "they who had done rightly," and making it the subject of יְהַלֵּכוּ, are both unwarranted. STUART well says that the makkeph in כֵּן־עָשׂוּ shows that the Masorites regarded כֵּן as the usual adverb *so*, and therefore joined it closely to the verb as simply qualifying. The references of ZÖCKLER and HITZIG do not bear them out, and there cannot be found a clear case in the Bible where כֵּן is used absolutely for justice. There are two objections to the finding in this phrase the subject of יְהַלֵּכוּ; one is the separation it makes between it and וּבָאוּ; the second is its coming so late after its verb, making a very unusual Hebrew construction in keeping the sense so long suspended. It seems quite clear that יְהַלֵּכוּ and וּבָאוּ have the same subject—not that a sudden change is unexampled in Hebrew, but because these two verbs so uniformly go together in similar expressions; as in ch. i. 4 דּוֹר הֹלֵךְ וְדוֹר בָּא "generation goes, and generation *comes*;" also vi. 4, בַּהֶבֶל בָּא וּבַחֹשֶׁךְ יֵלֵךְ "comes in vanity, goes away in darkness." So here there must be for both the same subject; but is it the wicked, mentioned above, or men generally, not personally or pronominally expressed, because it so readily suggests itself from the mention of burial,—*they*, the mourners, real or pretended,—they who form the procession (יְהַלֵּכוּ; see remarks on this word in piel, p. 85), who go about the streets, xii. 5, where סָבְבוּ includes both going to and coming from. According to this, there is, indeed, a change of subject from that of the previous clause, but this is far from being unexampled in Hebrew, even without notice; as in Ps. xlix. 19: "For he blesses himself in life, and *they* will praise [וְיוֹדֻךָ] thee,"—that is, men will praise thee, when thou doest well to thyself. Here, however, the personal subject is so familiar that it is easily understood, and its omission is on that very account all the more impressive: I saw the wicked buried, and from (or *to* and *from*) the holy place [the place of burial],—*they* came and went [men came and went]; then straight were they forgotten, that is, the wicked rulers were forgotten. The coming back to these as the old subject, after the mention of the funeral procession, seems very natural. The crowd disperses, the hired mourners "go about the streets;" it is all over; and soon are they "forgotten in the city where they thus had done,"—where they had ruled to their own dishonor, only to be hated, and at last, after an empty funeral pomp, to be consigned to oblivion. In the description of a scene so well understood, the formal insertion of the logical subject would have made it much less graphic. See Metrical Version.—T. L.]

*[On this word see remarks in the note appended to ZÖCKLER's Introduction, p. 33.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

not to be supplemented by יָמִים, as in the following verse.—**Yet surely I know that it shall be well with them that fear God.**—כִּי גַם, "yet," makes here a strong contrast. Koheleth represents the idea of just retribution as something certain and lasting, although experience seems so strongly to teach the contrary, and consequently as a conviction that does not rest on empirical observation, but on direct religious faith. "There is not expressed in this verse, as some commentators suppose, the thought of a retribution in after life, but it must be confessed that the standpoint of observation on which Koheleth here places himself could easily lead to this conclusion, although it is not here drawn (ELSTER).—**Which fear before him.**—Not, "because they fear before him;" אֲשֶׁר is here really a relative pronoun, pointing out the conformity of the conduct of the God-fearing to their designation as such. Comp. 1 Tim. v. 3: χήρας τίμα τὰς ὄντως χήρας.—**But it shall not be well with the wicked, neither shall he prolong his days.**—This denial of long life to the wicked does not contradict what is said in ver. 12; for there the question was not of long life, but of prolonged sinning.—**Which are as a shadow; because he feareth not before God.**—[ZÖCKLER: He is as a shadow who feareth not before God.] We have had the same figure in chap. vi. 12. The Vulgate, as well as most modern commentators, are correct in not joining כַּצֵּל, with the Masoretic accentuation, to what precedes [thus also LUTHER, VAIHINGER, HENGSTENBERG; "and as a shadow will not live long"], but to what follows [Vulg. "*transeunt*"].

8. *Third Strophe. Conclusion.* Vers. 14 and 15. Since the unequal distribution of human destiny points to the futile character of all earthly occurrences and conditions, we must so much the more enjoy present happiness, and profit by it with a contented mind.—**There is a vanity which is done upon the earth.**—See ver. 10 and chap. iii. 16. That the lots of the just and the wicked are frequently commingled and interchanged in this world, seems to the Preacher as vanity, *i. e.*, as belonging to the evil consequences of the human fall; but it does not, therefore, make on him an especially "bitter and gloomy" impression, as ELSTER supposes. Comp. HENGSTENBERG: "If there were righteous men such as there should be, wholly righteous, then the experience here given would certainly be in a high degree alarming. But since sin is also indwelling in the just, since they deserve punishment and need watchful care, since they can so easily slide into by-paths and fall into a mercenary worldliness, the shock must disappear for those who really dwell in righteousness. These latter are often severely disturbed by the fact here presented to view, but it is for them only a disturbance. The definitive complaint regarding this comes only from those who without claim or right count themselves among the just. And it is clear that the equality of result for the evil and just is only an *external* and *partial* one. To those whom God loves, every thing must be for the best, and the final issue separates the evil from the good."—Ver. 15. **Then I commended mirth,** *etc.**—Comp. the exegetical remarks on ii. 24; iii. 22; v. 19.—**For that shall abide with him of his labour the days of his life.**—Lit., "That clings to him," *etc.*, *i. e.*, that and that only becomes truly his; comp. חוּא חֶלְקוֹ chap. iii. 22; v. 19, which is synonymous in sense. The optative meaning of יִלְוֶנּוּ (HITZIG: "that may cling to him;" HERZFELD: "that may accompany him," *etc.*), is unnecessary and runs counter to the analogy of those earlier parallels.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

(*With Homiletical Hints.*)

The warnings against seduction through the snares and amorous arts of women, concerning rebellion against authority, and wicked oppression and violence, are quite dissimilar in their nature, and hang but loosely together. For in the first of these warnings the attention of the author is principally directed to the depraved nature of woman as the originator and principal representative of the ruin of man through sin; in the second, it is less the Divine necessity that is made especially emphatic, than the human utility and profitableness in the obedience to be rendered to kings; and in the third, the principal object of attention is not the wicked conduct of sinners in itself, but the fixed, certain, and just retribution of God for this conduct, together with the useful lesson which the good man is to draw therefrom. The questions concerning the origin, goal, and remedy of human depravity, [the most important problems in anthropology], are in this way touched, but by no means exhaustively treated; and the indicated solutions reveal a certain one-sidedness on account of the brevity of the illustration. It *appears*, at least, in chap. vii. 28, as if the female sex were thoroughly and without exception evil, and the first woman was represented as the sole originator of the sin of humanity; and just so it *seems* as if

*["*It was then I commended mirth,*" *etc.*; that is under such a view of mankind and their destiny. See the text note. The conjunction ו in וְשִׁבַּחְתִּי *connects* by showing the *time* and *reason*. It is very important as showing that the Epicurean aspect Koheleth sometimes exhibits was in connection with, and conditioned upon, such discouraging and gloomy views of human destiny as those just mentioned. And this explains the אֲשֶׁר, in what follows, as the matter or language of the false commendation (*quod*, ὅτι), "*that* there was no other good to man,"—or then "I praised mirth," *etc.* (saying), "that there was no good to man," *etc.*; and so of what follows: "and that this only remains to him," *etc.* It is all dependent on שִׁבַּחְתִּי, as the subject matter of the Epicurean commendation. ZÖCKLER omits all remarks on אֲשֶׁר here, and the connection of וְשִׁבַּחְתִּי, although it is so important.

'Twas *then* that pleasure I extolled:
How that there was no good to man beneath the sun,
Except to eat and drink, and [here] his joy to find,
And this alone attends him in his toil,
During all the days, *etc*.

Compare the Arabic البَقِيَّة *res residua*, as used in the Koran to denote the portion either of the pious in the life to come, or of the wicked pleasure-seekers in this world.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

the remedy against sin and its bad effects were mainly (chap. viii. 2 ff.) *unconditional* obedience to earthly authority; and then, again, it would appear (chap. viii. 15) that a *frivolous* and *thoughtless* joyousness were recommended. But that this is mere appearance, is proved by the connection of each of the respective passages. As in chap. vii. 29, not women alone, but sinning humanity as a whole, are presented as the destroyers of the originally upright, pure, and God-like nature [corresponding to the words of Paul, ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον, Rom. v. 12]; not less in chap. viii. 2 ff. is the duty of obedience to authority to be, from the beginning, Divinely influenced, and therefore subordinated to the higher duty of obedience towards God [corresponding with Acts iv. 19]. And finally, the joy recommended in ver. 15 appears clearly as the joy of one fearing God [comp. vers. 12 and 13], and consequently it no more forms an exclusive contrast to the rejoicing with trembling of Ps. ii. 11 than it contradicts the Apostolic admonition: "Rejoice in the Lord always" (Phil. iv. 4). In short, it is every where the conduct of the truly wise man, who, as such, is also the God-fearing man, to which the Preacher directs us, and in which he gets a view of the true ideal in the sphere of ethical anthropology (comp. vii. 23-25; viii. 1, 5).

Thence is drawn for a collective homiletical treatment of this section the following theme: the truly wise man fears God, and guards himself as well against unchastity as against the disloyalty and injustice of this world. Or, the truly wise man in conflict with the enticements of this world, as he meets them first in the cunning of women, secondly, in the desire of rebellion, and thirdly, in the wickedness and arrogant violence of tyrants.

HOMILETICAL HINTS ON SEPARATE PASSAGES.

Chap. vii. 23-25. GEIER:—Our knowledge is fragmentary: the more we learn, the more we perceive how far we are removed from true wisdom, Sirach li. 21 f.; 1 Cor. xiii. 9.—HANSEN:—No one on earth has the ability and skill to acquire a perfect knowledge of the works of God. They remain unfathomably deep and hidden from our eyes.—We must exert all the powers of our soul to discover the difference between wisdom and folly.—STARKE:—Depend not on your own strength in Christianity. You imagine that you make progress, but in reality you retrograde, and lose, in your spiritual arrogance, that which you had already acquired (2 John 8.).—The best teachers are those who teach to others what they themselves have learned by experience.

TÜBINGEN BIBLE:—Man was created in innocence, justice and holiness, and this is the image of God, that he lost after the fall, but after which he should again strive with all earnestness.—HENGSTENBERG:—After the fall, man forgot to remain in a receptive relation, which, in respect to the ἄνωθεν σοφία, is the only proper position; he chases after schemes of his presumptuous thoughts. The only means of becoming free from so dire a disease, and of being delivered from the bonds of his own thoughts and phantoms, is again to return to Divine subjection, and renouncing all his own knowledge, to permit himself to be taught of God.

Chap. viii. 1. ZEYSS:—Impenetrable as is the human heart in itself, it is nevertheless often betrayed by the countenance.—STARKE:—The innocent man looks happy and secure. He who cherishes injustice in the heart looks at no one cheerfully nor rightly.—HENGSTENBERG:—When, by the transforming power of wisdom, the heart of flesh has taken the place of the heart of stone, and inward flexibility and obedience that of terror in presence of God and His commandments, it becomes also evident in the countenance.

Vers. 2, 6. LUTHER:—It is enough for you to do so in the state, that you should obey the king's commands, and listen to him who is ordained of God. Here you see how civil obedience is comprehended in obedience to God. So Paul would have servants obey their masters, not as submitting to men, but as to God.—MELANCHTHON:—Thus is obedience ordained. Obey the Divine voice first; then the king commanding things not repugnant to the Divine law.—This will be in conformity with the rule given Acts iv. 19.—STARKE (ver. 8):—The powerful ones of this world have among men no higher one over them, to whom they must give an account, but in heaven there is One higher than the highest. Wisdom of Solomon vi. 2-4.—(Ver. 5): He who keeps the commandments of God will, for the sake of God and his conscience, also obey the salutary commands of authority, Col. iii. 23.—HENGSTENBERG (Ver. 5):—The wise heart knows well that as certainly as God will judge justly in His own time, so certainly also can he not be really and lastingly unhappy who keeps the commandments, and therefore has God on his side.—(Ver. 6): With all his power, man is nevertheless not independent, but is subjected to the heavy blows of human destiny. Thus all men will be unable to place any impediment to the execution of the justice of God for the good of His children.

Ver. 7, 8. HIERONYMUS (Ver. 8): We are not to mourn, though often oppressed by the unjust and powerful; since all these things come to an end in death, and the proud potentate himself, after all his tyrannical cruelties, cannot retain the soul when taken away by death.—CRAMER (Ver. 7):—It is vain that we anxiously trouble ourselves about the progress and issue of things to come; therefore we should abandon our prying desire. Ps. xxxvii. 5.—GEIER:—The last conflict and struggle is the hardest and most dangerous; but a pious Christian should not be terrified at it; for the conquest of Jesus over death will become his own through faith; temporal death is for him only a dissolution, a passing away in peace.

MELANCHTHON:—This question tortures all minds; so that many who see the prosperity of the wicked, and the misfortunes of the just, begin to think there is no Providence. It is the excelling strength of faith, that it is not broken by such spectacles, but retains the true cognition of God, and waits patiently for the judgment.—OSIANDER:—It does not become us to dictate to God how He shall rule the world. Let it satisfy us that God rules, and will finally bring to light

Digitized by Google

the justice of His judgment.—Because God delays a while in the punishment of sin, men falsely convince themselves that their wickedness will go wholly unpunished, Sirach v. 4, 5.—J. LANGE:—The children of God consider the patience of the Lord their salvation [2 Pet. iii. 15]; whilst the wicked consider this patience as a privilege to sin the more boldly (Rom. vi. 1). But however happy they may esteem themselves, they nevertheless die unblessed, and their happiness is changed into eternal shame.

Vers. 14 and 15. BERLEB. BIBLE:—Joy is a godly cheerfulness and serenity of soul; since the just man, though he may suffer from the vanities of this world, which are common to all, keeps his soul free from vain cares, calm through faith in God, and hence cheerful and ready in the performance of its duties; so that he eats, drinks and rejoices, *i. e.*, enjoys what God gives him, in a calm, cheerful, and fitting manner.—HENGSTENBERG:—[See previous exegetical illustrations to ver. 14].

FOURTH DISCOURSE.

Of the relation of true wisdom in the internal and external life of man.

(CHAP. VIII. 16—XII. 7.)

A. The unfathomable character of the universal rule of God should not frighten the wise man from an active part in life, but should cheer and encourage him thereto.

(CHAPTER VIII. 16—IX. 16.)

1. It cannot be denied that the providence of God in the distribution of human destiny is unfathomable and incomprehensible.

(CHAP. VIII. 16—IX. 6.)

16 When I applied mine heart to know wisdom, and to see the business that is done
upon the earth: (for also *there is that* neither day nor night seeth sleep with his
17 eyes:) Then I beheld all the work of God, that a man cannot find out the work
that is done under the sun: because though a man labour to seek *it* out, yet he
shall not find *it;* yea, further; though a wise *man* think to know *it,* yet shall he
not be able to find *it.*
IX. 1 For all this I considered in my heart even to declare all this, that the righteous
and the wise, and their works, *are* in the hand of God: no man knoweth either love
2 or hatred *by* all *that is* before them. All *things come* alike to all: *there is* one event
to the righteous and to the wicked; to the good, and to the clean, and to the
unclean; to him that sacrificeth, and to him that sacrificeth not; as *is* the good, so
3 *is* the sinner; *and* he that sweareth, as *he* that feareth an oath. This *is* an evil
among all *things* that are done under the sun, that *there is* one event unto all: yea,
also the heart of the sons of men is full of evil, and madness *is* in their heart while
4 they live, and after that *they go* to the dead. For to him that is joined to all the
5 living there is hope: for a living dog is better than a dead lion. For the living
know that they shall die: but the dead know not any thing, neither have they any
6 more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love, and their
hatred, and their envy, is now perished; neither have they any more a portion for
ever in any *thing* that is done under the sun.

2. Therefore it behooves us to enjoy this life cheerfully, and to use it in profitable avocations.

(VERS. 7–10).

7 Go thy way, eat thy bread with joy, and drink thy wine with a merry heart; for
8 God now accepteth thy works. Let thy garments be always white; and let thy
9 head lack no ointment. Live joyfully with the wife whom thou lovest all the days

Digitized by Google

of the life of thy vanity, which he hath given thee under the sun, all the days of
thy vanity: for that *is* thy portion in *this* life, and in thy labour which thou takest
10 under the sun. Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do *it* with thy might, for *there*
is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou
goest.

3. The uncertain result of human effort in this world should not deter us from zealously striving after wisdom.

Vers. 11–16.

11 I returned, and saw under the sun, that the race *is* not to the swift nor the battle
to the strong, neither yet bread to the wise, nor yet riches to men of understanding,
12 nor yet favour to men of skill; but time and chance happeneth to them all. For
man also knoweth not his time: as the fishes that are taken in an evil net, and as
the birds that are caught in the snare; so *are* the sons of men snared in an evil
13 time, when it falleth suddenly upon them. This wisdom have I seen also under the
14 sun, and it *seemed* great unto me: *There was* a little city, and few men within it;
and there came a great king against it, and besieged it, and built great bulwarks
15 against it: Now there was found in it a poor wise man, and he by his wisdom de-
16 livered the city; yet no man remembered that same poor man; Then said I, Wis-
dom *is* better than strength: nevertheless the poor man's wisdom *is* despised, and
his words are not heard.

[Ch. viii. 17.—בְּשֶׁל equivalent to בַּאֲשֶׁר ל, "in that which to"—"in proportion to;" Vulgate well renders it *quanto plus*. LXX. ὅσα ἐὰν; "in proportion to that which one shall labor"—or "the more he labors." It is found elsewhere only in Jonah i. 7, or, in composition, בְּשֶׁלְּמִי and בְּשֶׁלִּי. It is certainly not a Chaldaism, but it is said "to belong to the later Hebrew," and the argument runs in this way: Koheleth must belong to the later Hebrew, because this word is elsewhere found only in Jonah; and Jonah must belong to the later Hebrew, because this word is elsewhere found only in Koheleth. It is also called a Rabbinism in Koheleth; but it is rather a Kohelethism much employed, with other Kohelethisms, by the earliest Rabbins, because that book was a great favorite with them, and regarded by them as a specimen of the more elegant and courtly, as well as the more philosophical Hebrew.—Ch. ix. 1, וְלָבוּר; it has the same meaning here with ברר, Ecclesiastes iii. 18, to *explore—prove* by exploring—primary sense, *separate, purify*. It is an example of the affinity, or of the interchange of meanings, in verbs *ain wau* and double *ain*.—T. L.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. VAIHINGER deviates from the above analysis of this section into three divisions, but only so far as to extend the first division simply to chap. ix. 3, which does not well coincide with the contents of ver. 4-6, that clearly refer to what immediately precedes. Several commentators begin a new section with chap. ix. 11 [HAHN, indeed a new discourse], and deny in this way that the principal theme of the whole piece—the contrast between the inscrutability of human destinies, and the wisdom which still retains its worth, and is to be sought after as the highest good—is also treated in this last division, and that it is more closely allied with the foregoing than with that which follows ver. 17.—HENGSTENBERG also very improperly separates vers. 11, 12 from the four subsequent ones, with which they are most closely connected; see below at ver. 13.

First Strophe, first division. Chap. viii. 16, 17. **The universal rule of God is unfathomable.—When I applied mine heart.**—Lit., "gave;" comp. chap. viii. 9, כַּאֲשֶׁר introduces the longer primary clause, to which then, in ver. 17, a still longer secondary clause corresponds, introduced by וְ or וְרָאִיתִי. There is no closer connection with the preceding, such as is affirmed by ROSENMUELLER, HITZIG, HENGSTENBERG and HAHN, according to the example of most old authors. The commendation of pleasure in ver. 15, like the earlier praise of cheerfulness [chap. ii. 24; iii. 22; v. 18, 20], fittingly closes the preceding, whilst this clause, as is shown by כִּי chap. ix. 1, serves as a basis and preparation for the subsequent reflections.—**To know wisdom, and see the business.**—Comp. i. 13, 17. The word עִנְיָן is here as there the travail caused by a zealous searching after the grounds and aims of human action, fate, and life.—**For also there is that neither day nor night.** כִּי here gives the nature and operation of the travail; or is inferential, "so that," as Gen. xl. 15; Ex. iii. 11, *etc.* [comp. VAIHINGER]. The parenthetical interpretation of this third clause [EWALD, ELSTER, HAHN, *etc.*] is also unnecessary.—"To see sleep" is equivalent to enjoying sleep; comp. Gen. xxxi. 40; Prov. vi. 4; Ps. cxxxii. 4 (Lat. *somnum videre*).—Ver. 17. **Then I beheld all the work of God.** אֶת־כָּל־מַעֲשֵׂה הָאֱלֹהִים is the accusative of relation: "I saw in relation to all the work of God." The work that is done under the sun, that we find in the subsequent clause, is the same as the "work of God," the universal rule of the Most High; and the inability to find this work, its incomprehensibility and inscrutability [comp. Ps. cxlvii. 5; Rom. xi.

Digitized by Google

88] form from the beginning the principal theme of the assertion. To "find" is used in the sense of "to comprehend, to fathom;" comp. iii. 11; vii. 24.—**Because though a man labour to seek it out.**—That is, however much he may try, in spite of all his toil, *etc.* בְּשֶׁל אֲשֶׁר* is equivalent to בַּאֲשֶׁר—לַאֲשֶׁר [comp. the similar crowding of relations in Jonah i. 7, 8, 12, and also the Aramaic בְּדִיל דְּ], and signifies, when taken together with the following verb יַעֲמֹל, "with that which is in it," *etc.;* that is, "with that which there is in his labor," or "with that zeal and talent perceptible in it." Compare HITZIG on this passage, who correctly rejects as unnecessary EWALD's emendation בְּכָל אֲשֶׁר in place of בְּשֶׁל אֲשֶׁר, although the LXX., Vulgate, and Syriac seem to have so read it.—**Yea further, though a wise man think to know it.**—אִם יֹאמַר "should he presume," "should he attempt;" comp. Exod. ii. 14; 2 Sam. xxi. 16.

8. *First strophe, second division.* Chap. ix. 1-8. All men, the just, as well as the unjust, are subject to the same fate, especially to the law of mortality.—**For all this I considered in my heart.** Namely, when I applied my heart to know wisdom, chap. viii. 16. "All this" refers to what immediately follows.—**Even to declare all this.** The infinitive construct with לְ: לָבוּר continues the finite verb, as elsewhere the infinitive absolute; comp. Isa. xxxviii. 20; x. 32, בּוּר equivalent to בָּרַר (chap. iii. 18) is found only in this passage in the O. T.—**That the righteous and the wise, and their works, are in the hand of God.** That is, wholly dependent on Him, not capable, in any manner, independently to shape their life; so that their best actions may be followed by the saddest fate. Comp. HENGSTENBERG on this passage, who correctly shows that there is affirmed an unconditional dependence, not of human action in itself, but of its results on God.—**No man knoweth either love or hatred.** That is, no man knoweth in advance whether God will grant him love or hatred (*i. e.*, happiness or unhappiness); (MICHAELIS, KNOBEL, VAIHINGER, and HENGSTENBERG are correct). Others read: "No man knoweth whether he will love or hate;" [HITZIG, ELSTER]. But this interpretation is not in harmony with the text, and would give a sense which is foreign alike to the passage and the book, and for which chap. ii. 5 cannot be quoted as proof, as is done by HITZIG.—**By all that is before them.** That is, not as affirmed by HIERONYMUS, GEIER, and ROSENMUELLER,—all their destinies are clear, and as it were visible before their eyes, but the reverse: all their destinies lie in the dark uncertain future before them; they have yet everything to experience, happiness as well as unhappiness, good as well as evil. Comp. vii. 14, where אַחֲרָיו "behind him" signifies just the same as here לִפְנֵיהֶם "before them." Knobel unnecessarily insists that כֹּל here means: Everything is before them, everything can occur to them—even great misfortune—a sense that would need to be more clearly indicated by the context than is here the case.—Ver. 2.—**All things come alike to all.** That is, every thing happens to the wise and just as to all others; the just have no special fortune, they share the common fate of all (in this world of course). KNOBEL, EWALD, HEILIGSTEDT, UMBREIT, and HENGSTENBERG correctly take this position, whilst HITZIG and ELSTER include the following words מִקְרֶה אֶחָד, and so bring out this somewhat obscure and distorted thought: "All are as all, they meet one fate;" but VAIHINGER takes הַכֹּל at the beginning of the verse as an elliptical repetition from ver. 1: "Yes all! Just as all have the same destiny," *etc.*—**There is one event to the righteous and to the wicked.** Not that they are the offspring and the victims of one and the same blind power of chance [HITZIG], but they are subjected to one and the same divine providence as regards the issue of their life. HENGSTENBERG justly says: "Chance (מִקְרֶה) just as in iii. 19 (comp. ii. 14, 15), does not form the counterpart to divine providence, but to the spontaneous activity on the part of the just."—**To the good and to the clean and to the unclean.** In order that one may not take clean and unclean in the levitical or externally legal sense, but in the moral sense, the kindred thought of טוֹב (good) precedes that of טָהוֹר (pure) as explanatory.—**He that sweareth as he that feareth an oath.** That is, the frivolous swearer, and he that considers an oath sacred. That this is the sense is plainly seen in chap. viii. 2, from which passage it appears that it does not enter the author's mind to condemn the oath in general as something immoral. VAIHINGER is of opinion that by him that feareth an oath, as by him that does not sacrifice, is meant an Essene, or at least a representative of growing Essenianism. But the designation is by no means clear enough for this; and the one not sacrificing seems clearly to be a wicked contemner of the levitical laws concerning the temple and sacrifices, and not an unreasonably conscientious ascetic in the sense of Essenianism.—Ver. 3.—**This is an evil among all things that are done under the sun.** רָע בְּכֹל וגו cannot mean the worst of all, *etc.* (ROSENMUELLER, VAIHINGER) but in the absence of the article before רָע (comp. the Song of Solomon i. 8; Jos. xiv. 15, *etc.*), simply bad, evil among all things, or in all things; therefore an evil accompanying and dwelling in every earthly occurrence.—**That there is one event unto all.** Namely, that befalls all. מִקְרֶה must be taken as in verse 2, and points out, therefore, not what one meets with in life, but its issue, its end. The equal liability of all to death, even the good and the just, is designated by Koheleth as that evil, that evil thing that is mixed with every earthly occurrence; (comp. Rom. v. 14, 21; 1 Cor. xv. 55 f.; Heb. ii. 15). **Yea, also the heart of the sons of**

*[See the text note on this word, and the simple translation of the Vulgate and LXX., which came from the text as it is.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

men is full of evil; namely, in consequence of this their liability to the power of death, which, therefore, also in addition exerts a demoralizing effect on them; comp. chap. viii. 11.—**And after that they go to the dead.** The suffix to אַחֲרָיו is to be considered as neuter, ("and after this condition," comp. Jer. li. 46), not masculine as if the sense were "and after it" (*i. e.*, after this life) as in vi. 12; x. 14. The preposition of motion (אֶל in אֶל הַמֵּתִים) "indicates that the sense of 'it goes,' is to complete the sentence," HITZIG.

4. *First strophe, conclusion.* Vers. 4-6. In spite of the presentation just given, the condition of the living is ever to be preferred to that of the dead.—**For to him that is joined** (ZÖCKLER, taking the reading יְבֻחַר translates it, "who is it that is preferred?"—T. L.). Thus according to the k'tib יְבֻחַר, pual of בחר "to choose, prefer," does VAIHINGER more correctly give the sense: "There is no one who would be here preferred and accepted, or who would have a choice, who would be exempted from death; since dying is a common fate; each one must go to the dead; but in death there is nothing more to hope." In the same way, substantially, does ELSTER translate, except that he punctuates יִבְחַר, and therefore gives it actively; "For who has any choice?" Many later commentators adhere to the k'ri יְחֻבַּר, which the LXX. read (τίς ὃς κοινωνεῖ πρὸς πάντας τοὺς ζῶντας) together with Symmachus and the Targum. They translate, therefore, with EWALD, "who is joined to the living has hope," or, with HITZIG, interrogatively, "who is it who would be joined to all the living?" But the sense thus arising makes a very forced* connection; and the translation of HAHN, who takes the word חבר in the sense of "charming," is open to very weighty linguistic objections.—**To all the living there is hope.** Literally, "for all living," for all as long as they live. The grammatical expression does not accord with HENGSTENBERG's interpretation: "One may trust to all living;" for אֶל is used with the verb בטח (Ps. iv. 6; xxxi. 7), but not with the substantive בִּטָּחוֹן for the introduction of the one in whom the confidence is placed. Comp. Job xi. 18.—**For a living dog is better than a dead lion.** For the most contemptible and hateful thing that lives (comp. for the proverbial use of the dog in this relation, 1 Sam. xvii. 43; 2 Sam. ix. 8; Isa. lxvi. 8; Matt. xv. 26; Rev. xxii. 15, *etc.*) is more valuable than the most majestic of all beasts if it is dead; (for the majesty and glory of the lion as the king of beasts, consult Isa. xxxviii. 13; Hosea xiii. 7; Lamentations iii. 10; Job x. 16). This proverb is also known to the Arabs. See GOLIUS, *Adag. Cent.* 2, n. 8.

Ver. 5.—**For the living know that they shall die.** The consciousness of the necessity of death, is here presented not as the only, but yet as the characteristic superiority of the living over the dead, just as if only the necessity of death were the object of human knowledge—an individualizing statement of an ironical and yet most serious nature.—**Neither have they any more reward.** Not that they have had their share (HITZIG) but that God no longer exercises retributive justice towards them, because they are wanting in conscious, personal life. The fact of a retribution in a world beyond, is only apparently denied here, for the author now sees only the conditions of this world: on the subsequent fate of a spirit returned to God he is for the present entirely silent (chap. xii. 7; comp. xi. 9)—**For the memory of them is forgotten.** So entirely do the dead remain without reward; not even the smallest thing that could profit them here below, not even the preservation of their memory with their posterity, is granted to them. Comp. Ps. xxxi. 12; Job xiv. 21. It is doubtful whether זֵכֶר "memory" is intended to rhyme with the preceding שָׂכָר "reward" (as HITZIG supposes). It is more probable that such a rhyming is made in the following verse between שִׂנְאָתָם and קִנְאָתָם.—Ver. 6. A continued description of the sad fate of the dead; "from the very beginning with touching depth of tone, a strain of lamentation overpowering the author" (HITZIG). **Also their love and their hatred and their envy is now perished.** That is, not that they are deprived of the objects of their love, hatred, or envy (KNOBEL), but these sentiments and activities themselves have ceased for them; as רפאים they are destitute of all affections, interests, and exertions, and lead rather a merely seeming life. (ROSENMUELLER, HITZIG). The sad existence of departed souls in Scheol, as described in Job xiv. 11 ff., seems here to hover before the author, just as in ver. 10 below, he expressly speaks of it. It is significant that he denies them love as well as hatred, and would seem thereby to mark their condition as one extremely low.

5. *Second strophe*, vers. 7-10. On account of this superiority of life, compared with the condition of the dead, and the uncertainty of human fate in general, it behooves us to enjoy life cheerfully (vers. 7-9), and to use it zealously in the activity of our vocations (ver. 10).—**Go thy way, eat thy bread with joy, and drink thy wine with a merry heart.** (Comp. ii. 24; v. 19). This collective triad, "eat, drink, and be merry," is here, as it were, increased to a quartette; joy being doubly designated, first as it finds its expression in cheerful adornments of the body and appropriate ornament, and then in loving unison with a wife.—Wine* is used as a symbol and producer of joy, and also in chap. x. 19; Gen. xxvii. 25; Ps. civ. 15, *etc.* For בְּלֶב־טוֹב, "of joyful heart, gay," comp. 1 Sam. xxv. 38; also chap. vii. 3 of the foregoing.—**For God now accepteth thy works.** That is, not that God finds pleasure in just this eating, drinking, *etc.* (HITZIG),

*[It may well be said, on the other hand, that the exceedingly forced rendering of ZÖCKLER and VAIHINGER show that the common translation "*joined, associated*," and the reading יְחֻבַּר on which it is grounded, are correct.—T. L.]

*["And merrily drink thy wine." No where do we find more of the Bacchanalian expression, and yet ZÖCKLER would regard it here as the "innocent and normal use of wine." (See his comment on x. 19): whilst elsewhere, with no difference of language, it denotes, he says, the "corrupting and licentious use." The irony of the passage is shown at once by comparing it with vii. 2 and ii. 2.—T. L.]

but, thy moral conduct and efforts have long pleased Him,* wherefore thou mayst hope in the future surely to receive thy reward from Him. (HENGSTENBERG correctly takes this position).—Ver. 8. **Let thy garments be always white.** White garments are the expression of festive joy and pure, calm feelings in the soul, comp. Rev. iii. 4 f.; vii. 9 ff. Koheleth could hardly have meant a literal observance of this precept, so that the conduct of Sisinnius, Novatian bishop of Constantinople, who, with reference to this passage, always went in white garments, was very properly censured by Chrysostom as Pharisaical and proud. HENGSTENBERG's view is arbitrary, and in other respects scarcely corresponds to the sense of the author: "White garments are here to be put on as an expression of the confident hope of the future glory of the people of God, as SPENER had himself buried in a white coffin as a sign of his hope in a better future of the Church."—**And let thy head lack no ointment.** As in 2 Sam. xii. 20; xiv. 2; Isa. lxi. 3; Amos vi. 6; Prov. xxvii. 9; Ps. xlv. 8, so here appears the anointing oil, which keeps the hair smooth and makes the face to shine, as a symbol of festive joy, and a contrast to a sorrowing disposition. There is no reason here for supposing fragrant spikenard (Mark xiv. 2), because the question is mainly about producing a good appearance by means of the ointment, comp. Ps. cxxxiii. 2.—Ver. 9.—**Live joyfully with the wife whom thou lovest.** That is, enjoy life with her, comp. iii. 1; Ps. xxxiv. 12; and also chap. vii. 28, above, to which expression, apparently directed against all intercourse with women, the present one serves as a corrective.—**All the days of the life of thy vanity.** This short repetition of the preceding ("all the days of thy vain life, which he has given thee under the sun") is left out of the *Septuagint* and *Chaldaic*, but is produced in the *Vulgate*, and should be by no means wanting, because it points with emphasis† to the vanity of life as a principal motive to joy.—**For that is thy portion in this life and in thy labor,** *etc.* That is, for this cheerful and moderate enjoyment of life shall, according to the will of God, compensate thee for the toil and labor which this life brings with it; comp. ii. 10; iii 22; v. 18.—Ver. 10.—**Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might.** The word בְּכֹחֲךָ is by the *Vulgate* and most modern authors joined to עֲשֵׂה, whilst according to the accents and the collocation, it belongs to what precedes. But it is a vigorous doing, nevertheless, that is here recommended; for the sense is clear: whatsoever presents itself, is to be performed with thy strength, whatsoever offers itself to thee as an object for thy exertion, that do! For the expression, "whatsoever thy hand findeth to do," comp. 1 Sam. x. 7; xxiii. 8; Judges ix. 33; also Isa. x. 13, 14.—**For there is no work nor device,** *etc.*, **in the grave whither thou goest.** comp. ver. 6. As Koheleth gives a motive here in his admonition to an active life, by pointing to the lifeless and inactive condition of departed souls in the realm of death, so speaks Christ in John ix. 4: *ἐμὲ δεῖ ἐργάζεσθαι ἕως ἡμέρα ἐστίν· ἔρχεται νύξ ὅτε οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐργάζεσθαι.* Since the *νύξ* (night) mentioned in John ix. 4 and elsewhere, is clearly something else than the שְׁאוֹל of this passage, there is no definite reference to the latter, as HENGSTENBERG affirms, but between the two assertions there is a certain analogy.

---

*[As there is nothing said about moral conduct in the text, or any other conduct except unrestrained eating and drinking, this remark of ZÖCKLER's is perfectly gratuitous. If it is to be taken as serious advice of Koheleth, then HITZIG's view is far more logical: "It is just this eating, drinking, *etc.*, that God approves beforehand, so that you can indulge, without any scruple to disturb your sensual joy." How contrary this is to other declarations of Koheleth we have elsewhere shown. How utterly opposed it is to other numerous passages of Scripture need not be pointed out. It is equivalent to saying God will never "bring thee into judgment" for it, or that He is utterly indifferent. See the Appendix to this Division, p. 134.—T. L.]

†[Ver. 9. "*The days of thy vain life,*" or, more literally, "*all the days of the life of thy vanity.*" The lxx. left out this second mention because they regarded it as a mere repetition. MARTIN GEIER would connect it, not with the former, which he says would be *odiosa repetitio*, but specially with what is said about the wife, as indicating that the conjugal relation continues through life, as also the idea, Luke xxvi. 36, that there is no marriage in the other world. Other commentators have, in like manner, been disturbed by it, but it only shows that no amount of piety, or of learning, will fit a man to be a true interpreter of this book without something of the poetic spirit by which it is pervaded. It is not *emphasis* merely, much less an enforced motive to joy, that this repetition gives us, as HITZIG and ZÖCKLER maintain, but a most exquisite pathos in view of the transitoriness and poverty of life. The style of diction reveals the style of thought, showing how far it is from the Epicurean sentiment of any kind, whether gross or moderate. It is the language of one musing, soliloquizing, full of some touching thought that causes him to linger over his words, and keep their sad music in his ear. There are examples of it in the Greek poets, especially in HOMER, which have led the ancient writers on rhetoric to give it a technical name. Thus PLUTARCH calls it *ἐπαναφορά*, and so also the later writer MACROBIUS, *Saturnal.* Lib. iv. 6, more particularly describes it: *Nascitur pathos et de repetitione quam Græci ἐπαναφορὰν vocant, cum sententiæ ab iisdem nominibus incipiunt:* "Pathos also comes from repetition, which the Greeks call *epanaphora*, when sentences begin from the same words." It receives some of its best illustrations from passages in the *Iliad*, such as xx. 371, xxiii. 641, and especially xxii. 126, which, though very different from this, in other respects, has this same kind of pathetic repetition. It is Hector soliloquizing in the time of his awful danger from the near approach of Achilles—

οὐ μέν πως νῦν ἐστιν ἀπὸ δρυὸς οὐδ' ἀπὸ πέτρης,
τῷ ὀαριζέμεναι, ἅτε παρθένος ἠΐθεός τε,
παρθένος—ἠΐθεός τ' ὀαρίζετον ἀλλήλοιϊν.

No time for such a friendly parley now,
As when from oak and rock, *the youth and maid,*
The youth and maid, hold parlance sweet together.

Very different is the sentence of Solomon in its subject matter, but like it in pathos, in the peculiar repetitive diction to which it gives rise, and the musing state of soul from which it flows:

Go then, with gladness eat thy bread, and merrily drink thy wine,
Thy garments ever white, thy head with fragrant oil adorned;
Enjoy with her whom thou dost love, *the days of thy vain life,*—
The days of thy vain life, the all, that God has given to thee Beneath the sun.

It is indeed irony, but not that of scorning sarcasm, nor of heartless satire. It is the irony of Scripture, full of a mournful tenderness, taking this as its most impressive form of serious admonition. Interpreted in its spirit, and even by what is rhetorically revealed upon its face, there is no contradiction between it and vii. 2, 3; ii. 2; and other passages in this book that represent sobriety, and even sadness, as morally and spiritually better for man than mirth. We have dwelt more fully on these topics, and at the hazard of some repetition, in the extended excursus on the alleged Epicureanism of Koheleth, p. 131. It has been done, because no ideas suggested by the book seemed more important in their bearing upon its thorough interpretation.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

6. *Third strophe, Introduction.* Vers 11 and 12. Human actions in this world depend entirely on divine fate, and their success, therefore, is too often in no comparison with the real ability and strength of the actor.—**I returned.**—Comp. chap. iv. 1. For the infinitive absolute וְרָאֹה comp. chap. viii. 9.—**That the race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong.** These remarks serve only to illustrate what follows: "**Neither yet bread to the wise, nor yet riches to men of understanding, nor yet favor to men of skill.**" חֵן favor, as in Ex. iii. 22; xi. 3; xii. 36, *etc.* —**But time and chance happeneth to them all.**—That is, the success of human actions depends wholly on that higher power which controls the change of seasons, and permits men to be met sometimes by this, sometimes by that (פֶּגַע) which "happens, meets;" (comp. 1 Kings v. 18). A New Testament parallel is found in Rom. ix. 16, where, instead of time and chance, divine mercy is called the highest power in all human affairs.—Ver. 12. **For man also knoweth not his time.** A conclusion, *a majori ad minus.* "Even over his time itself, over his person and his life, to say nothing of his actions (ver. 11), there is a controlling power outside of him" (Hitzig). The "time" of a man is here clearly equivalent to the time of his destruction; as elsewhere the "day," of Job xviii. 20; or the "hour," Job xii. 27; Mark xiv. 41. Comp. also chap. vii. 17 preceding.—**As the fishes that are taken.** For net, and noose, and trap, as symbols of the judgments overtaking men, comp. Hosea vii. 12; Ezek. xii. 13; xxxii. 3; Prov. vii. 23; Luke xxi. 35.—**So are the sons of men snared.** יוּקָשִׁים Part. Pual see Ew. § 169. d. The word strikingly represents the helpless condition of men in the presence of divine destiny, that can put an end to their life at any moment, as the fowler who suddenly robs of its life the bird caught in the snare. An allusion to the catastrophe threatened to the Persian kingdom by a new universal monarchy, the Macedonian, is not found in the passage, as Hengstenberg supposes.

7. *Third strophe. Conclusion.* Vers. 13-16. In spite of that dependence of human destiny and success on a higher power, which often violently interferes with them, wisdom remains, nevertheless, a valuable possession, still able to effect great results with inconsiderable means of an external character, as is seen in the example of a poor and despised man, who, by his wisdom, became the deliverer of his native city from threatening danger of destruction. Whether this example is a purely feigned didactic story (thus think Hengstenberg, Luther, Mercerus, Starke, *et al.*), or whether it refers to an historical fact within the experience of the author, must remain uncertain, on account of the general character of the description; and this so much the more so, because the only passage that could seem to refer to a definite fact from Persian history (ver. 15) is of doubtful exposition. — **This wisdom have I seen also under the sun.** (Zöckler, this have I seen as wisdom). The words גַּם זֹה רָאִיתִי חָכְמָה must clearly be thus translated (comp. the similar construction in chap. vii. 25), not, "thus also saw I wisdom," *etc.* (thus usually), or, "this also have I seen: wisdom,"* *etc.* (as Hitzig renders it,) changing זֹה into זֶה.—**And it seemed great unto me,** *i. e.*, it appeared large, comp. Jonah iii. 8.—Ver. 14.—**There was a little city, and few men within it.** That is, not few inhabitants in general, but few fighting men available for defence—a circumstance which shows the danger of the city to be so much greater, and the merits of its deliverer to be so much more brilliant.—**And there came a great king against it.** We cannot deduce from the expression that the great king was the Persian; because the predicate גָּדוֹל attributed to the hostile king serves mainly to show the contrast to the smallness of the city, and the great size of the army led against it.—**And built great bulwarks against it.** מְצוֹדִים (from מָצוֹד "an instrument for seizure," hence sometimes a "net;" *e. g.* vii. 26) is here used only in the signification of bulwarks, and must therefore not here be confounded with the more customary מְצוּרִים (Deut. xx. 20; Micah iv. 14), as two manuscripts here read.—Ver. 15. **Now there was found in it a poor wise man.** Literal, "one found in it," impersonal—not, "he, the king found." —**Yet no man remembered that same poor man.** [Zöckler renders in the pluperfect "had remembered," *etc.*, and then makes it the ground of the remarks that follow. —T. L.] We can neither urge against this pluperfect rendering of וְאָדָם לֹא זָכַר the circumstance that the one in question is here designated as אִישׁ מִסְכֵּן and not as חָכָם (for the predicate poor is clearly to point out why they did not remember him—), nor also the contents of the following verse. For in it the emphasis lies upon the commendation of wisdom contained in the first clause, not on the subsequent restrictive remark concerning the contempt and disregard that it often meets with. Vaihinger is correct in his deviation from Hitzig, Ewald, Elster, and most modern authors, who, like the *Vulgate* and Luther, translate: "no man remembered." As certain as this sense, according to which the discussion would be concerning a deliverer of his country, rewarded with the ingratitude of his fellow-citizens, is approached neither through language nor connection, just so certainly may we not (with Ewald and some ancient authors) here find an allusion to Themistocles as deliverer

*[A much clearer sense, and better adapted to the whole spirit of the passage, is obtained by taking חָכְמָה in the concrete, like the Greek τὸ σοφόν, for a *wise thing*, a problem, a mystery, something that requires wisdom to explain it. Such use of it, though not found elsewhere in the Hebrew, is justified by the perfectly parallel Greek idiom, and by what is demanded to represent the peculiar thinking of this book. The mystery, puzzle, τὸ σοφόν, φιλοσόφημα, ζήτημα, *inquiry*, is the curious case which he is going to state. The use of חָכְמָה, chap. vii. 25, is quite dissimilar. This view is confirmed by what follows: "and *it* seemed great to me."—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

of Athens from the hand of Xerxes: and this latter so much the less because Athens could scarcely have been designated by the author as עִיר קְטַנָּה. HITZIG is of opinion that the besieged city is the little sea port Dora, vainly besieged by Antiochus the Great in the year 218 (Polyb. v. 66); but nothing is known of the deliverance of this city by a "poor wise man," and for many reasons the epoch of this book cannot be brought down to so late an era as that of Antiochus Magnus. Comp. the Introduction, § 4, Obs. 3.—Ver. 16. The moral of the story, is given in the words of Koheleth uttered immediately after he had heard it.—**Then said I, wisdom is better than strength.** Comp. similar sentences in chap. vii. 19; Prov. xiv. 29; xvi. 32; xxi. 22; xxiv. 5.—**Nevertheless the poor man's wisdom is despised.** These words, which again limit the praise of wisdom expressed above, depend also on the expression, "Then said I." They refer, according to ver. 15, to the fact that in the beginning no one had thought of the wisdom of that deliverer of the city—and not even of the ingratitude afterwards shown to him, or of not having followed his wise counsels (which latter view however would be in antagonism with ver. 15, according to which the sorely pressed city was really delivered).

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

(*With Homiletical Hints.*)

As the previous section contained a series of ethical precepts with an anthropological foundation (similar to the one preceding it) so is this one a combination of *theological* and ethical truths, which the author lays to the heart of his readers. And it is especially the doctrine of the incomprehensibility of the decrees and judgments of God, and of the hidden character of His universal rule that the author treats, and from which he derives the duties of a cheerful enjoyment and use of the blessings of life (ix. 7-9) of an untiring activity (ix. 10) and of continued striving after practical wisdom as a possession that is valuable under all circumstances. The contents are therefore similar to those of chap. iii., only that there the principal thought is of the conditioning and restrictive character of the divine counsels and acts of universal rule; here, on the contrary, the prominent idea is their hidden and unsearchable nature (Rom. ix. 33; 1 Cor. xiii. 12). This section is also in close relation with chap. vi., especially in regard to its ethical and practical precepts (comp. ix. 9, with vi. 12; ix. 14, with vi. 8; ix. 1-6, with vi. 2-6, *etc.*), only that from the former, the conclusions drawn are mainly serious and gloomy, while from the latter they are predominantly cheerful.

Homily on the whole section. The thought of the brevity of human life, and the obscurity of that which awaits us in it, should not discourage but impel us to a ready and cheerful use of the blessings granted us here below, as well as of the powers for a truly wise exertion; or more briefly: Of the blessing and value of reflections concerning death, as an impulse to the zealous fulfilment of the avocations of life.

HOMILETICAL HINTS TO SEPARATE PASSAGES.

Chap. viii. 16, 17. HIERONYMUS:—He shows that there are causes for all things, why each thing should thus be, and that there is righteousness in all, though they may be latent and beyond the comprehension.—ZEYSS: a Christian should neither show himself negligent in investigating the works of God, nor too curious.—HANSEN: God's works that He performs among the children of men have eternity in view, and nothing short of eternity will open up to us their inner perfection, Rev. xv. 3.—BERLENB. BIBLE: —O ye poor blind men, who think to fathom by your wisdom the cause of divine providences; ye are indeed greatly deceived! You condemn everything that surpasses our understanding, when you should rather confess that these things are so much the more divine, the more they surpass your comprehension. The more trouble you take to fathom the secrets of wisdom by your own study, so much the less do you attain your goal. The true test that a man possesses genuine wisdom, is when he is assured that he cannot comprehend the mysteries of God as He deals with souls.—HENGSTENBERG:—Blessed is the man who accepts without examination all that God sends him, in the firm trust that it is right, however wrong it may appear, and that to those who love God all things must be for the best.

Chap. ix. 1-3. BRENZ (ver. 1):—There are those whom God loves and whom He hates. For He does not cast off the whole human race, though He might justly do so; neither does He embrace all men in His favor; but to some He deigns to grant His mercy, whilst others He leaves to their own destruction. There is, however, no one who can know by any external sign, whom God receives or rejects.—(Ver. 2, 3). Whoever in faith looks into the word of God may easily know that, though the wicked may now seem to have the same fortune with the pious, there shall come, at last, a clear discrimination between the good and the bad, adjudging the one class to eternal punishment, the others to the happiness of everlasting life.—GEIER (ver. 2, 3). We cannot judge of the condition of the dead after this life, by our reason, but only by its accordance with the revealed word of God.—HANSEN:—We are to ascribe it to the peculiarities of this present life, if the just suffer with the wicked; Sirach xl. 1 ff.

ZEYSS:—A child of God should love this life not on account of temporal prosperity, but for the honor of God, and the welfare of his neighbor. CRAMER:—So long as the wicked lives, it is better for him than if he is dead, since he has yet time to repent. But when he is dead then all hope for him is lost. STARKE:—Atheists live in the foolish delusion that after death all is over and that the soul ceases with the death of the body; but they will receive the most emphatic contradiction on the great day of judgment.

Vers. 7-10. LUTHER (ver. 7):—You live in a world where there is nothing but sorrow, misery, grief, and death, with much vanity: therefore use life with love, and do not make your own life sour and heavy with vain and anxious cares.—Solomon does not say this to the secure and wick-

Digitized by Google

ed children of the world, but to those truly fearing and believing God. These latter he consoles, and desires that they may cheerfully take comfort in God. To the former He says rejoice, but does not bid those to drink wine, eat, *etc.*, who are but too much inclined to do so, and pass their lives in idleness and voluptuousness as wicked and depraved men.

ZEYSS (ver. 7):—The believers have more claim to the gifts of God than the unbelievers (1 Cor. iii. 21, 22), although they may enjoy them the least.—(ver. 9). Marriage is a sacred and wise ordinance of God; therefore the Christian may use it with a good conscience; but it must be enjoyed in the fear of God, Eph. v. 31. STARKE (ver. 8):—Arrogance, pride, and display in dress are very common vices in these latter times: the children of God find it very difficult to suppress these in themselves.—(ver. 10). The obligations that you owe to the body, you owe doubly to the soul. O man neglect not the labor due to thy soul; the night of death is coming when no one can work.—CRAMER (ver. 10):—We should perform the work of our calling with a resolute and confident spirit, and never hesitate in our charge.—HENGSTENBERG (ver. 10):—That we should do all that lies in our power is required by the facts that what we leave undone here below is never done, that the tasks placed upon us by God for this life, and which here remain unperformed, never find their performance, and that the gifts and powers conferred on us for this life must be used in this life.

Vers. 11 and 12. TÜBINGEN BIBLE:—Even in temporal things it does not depend upon any one's will or movements, but only on God's mercy. Everything is derived from God's blessing.—STARKE (ver. 12):—By his skill man can calculate the rising and setting of the sun; but human wisdom does not extend so far that one can tell when the sun of his life will rise or set.—HENGSTENBERG:—If it seems sad with the people of God when the world triumphs, let us reflect that such result does not depend on the might, or the weakness of men; and that a sudden catastrophe may overwhelm the highest, and cast him to the ground. Have we God for our friend? it all comes to that as the only thing that can decide.

Ver. 13-16. MELANCHTHON:—Such a poor man, in a city, was Jeremiah, as he himself writes, a man who saved the church in the midst of disorder and confusion. At the same time the precept admonishes us that good counsels are listened to by the few, whilst the worst please the many. And thus he says; The poor man's wisdom is despised.—CARTWRIGHT:—Wisdom, however splendid, if in lowly state, is so obscured by the cloud of poverty that in a brief time it has all eyes averted, and utterly falls from the memory.

CRAMER:—Thou shouldst laud no one on account of his high estate, and despise no one on account of his low estate. For the bee is a very little creature, and yet gives the sweetest fruit.—STARKE:—The heart of man is by nature so corrupt that to its own injury it is inclined to run after folly, and be disobedient to wisdom.—But true wisdom always finds those who know and love her. Though a wise man may for a time dwell in obscurity, he will nevertheless be drawn forth from it before he is aware. Wisdom of Solomon x. 13, 14.

APPENDIX.

[I. KOHELETH'S IDEA OF THE DEAD.—Chap. ix. 5:—

The living know that they must die, the dead they nothing know;
For them there is no more reward—forgotten is their name;
Their love, their hate, their zeal, all perished now;
Whilst the world lasts, no portion more have they
In all the works performed beneath the sun.

STUART thinks that the Preacher "claims small merit for the living, merely the knowledge that they must die." "Is this," he asks, "better than not knowing any thing?" He argues, besides, that there is an inconsistency in such a view, made greater by the fact that this praise of life is one of the cheering passages, whereas such declarations as vii. 1; iv. 2-3 are from the desponding mood. Is not this, however, a mistake? The language here is gloomy, if not wholly desponding. Koheleth is perplexed and bewildered as he contemplates the apparent state of the dead, especially as it presents itself to the *sense*, inactive, motionless, silent, unheeding. He turns to the living, and surveys their condition, so full of vanity, with only the superiority of a little knowledge, one important element of which is a knowledge that this vanity must come to an end. It is just the survey that would give rise to that touching irony already spoken of, that mournful smile at human folly, in which a just contempt is blended with deepest sympathy,—an irony, not sneering, but tenderly compassionate, such as we find in some other Scriptures. As, for example, in Gen. iii. 22, where God is represented as ironically repeating the words of Satan, but in a spirit how different from that of the fiend! Ah, poor wretch! he knows it now, the difference between good and evil! See Gen., p. 240. So here, as though he had said, "Alas, their boasted knowledge! They know that they must die,—this is the substance of it, the remotest bound to which their science reaches." There is something of the same feeling in what is here affirmed of the state of the dead. It gloomily contemplates only the physical aspect, or the physical side of death, such as presents itself, sometimes, to the Christian, without any feeling of inconsistency, and without impairing that hope of future life which he possesses in a higher degree than Koheleth. We may even say that it is good for us, occasionally, to fix our minds on this mere physical aspect of our frail humanity.

O when shall spring visit the mouldering urn?
O when shall day dawn on the night of the grave?

It was not an infidel, but a devout believer, that wrote this. And so, too, there may be, at times, a sort of melancholy pleasure in thinking of death mainly in its aspect of repose from the toils and anxieties of the present stormy life; as in that mournful dirge so often sung at funerals—

Unveil thy bosom, faithful tomb;
Take this new treasure to thy trust;
And give these sacred relics room
To slumber in the silent dust.

Digitized by Google

Nor pain, nor grief, nor anxious fear,
Invade thy bounds; no mortal woes
Can reach the peaceful sleeper here.

We feel no inconsistency between such strains, even when they assume a more sombre aspect, and that brighter view which the Christian takes in contemplating the spiritual side of our strange human destiny, or even as it sometimes presented itself to the Old Testament believer (Ps. xvi. 11; xvii. 15; lxxiii. 24). They no more jar upon our speculative theology than the language of our Saviour, John ix. 4: "The night cometh, when no man can work" [comp. Ecclesiastes ix. 10; xi. 8], or that touching language of the New Testament which represents death under the soothing conception of a sleep—*κοίμησις*—a lying down to rest. This term is not confined to the body, as the best exegesis would show, but would seem to denote also a most blessed state of quiescence for the spirit,—a state rudimental, imperfect, unfinished, anomalous, preparatory, yet most *secure*,—tranquil, yet not torpid—inactive, yet not inert—a holy conscious rest, a lying "under the shadow of the Almighty,"—separate from the present world, away from all its busy doings, if not from all its memories, and thus cradled again, nursed and educated, we may say, for that higher finished life, when death shall be fully conquered. He is the last and greatest enemy [1 Cor. xv. 26] who, until that time, retains some dominion over all humanity,—even over those "who *sleep in* Jesus," or "*through* Jesus," as it should be rendered,—the saved, or rather, the being saved [present participle, *οἱ σωζόμενοι*] *the being healed*, or made *alive*, as the Syriac has it, those in whom the redemptive life of Christ is overcoming death, and growing to the matured and perfect life of eternity. For it is clear, even from the New Testament, that this "*state* of death," or reign of death, still continues, in a certain sense, and in a certain degree, until the resurrection. Its power is over all men, and over the whole man, soul and body, although for the Christian, whose "life is hid with Christ in God" [Col. iii. 8], its sting is taken quite away. There is no mistaking the language, 1 Cor. xv. 54: *ὅταν δὲ τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσηται ἀφθαρσίαν κ. τ. λ.* It is only when this corruption puts on incorruption, and this mortal puts on immortality, that there is brought to pass the saying, "*Death is swallowed up in victory.*" Till then, Death and Hades go together. One is but the continuation of the other. Being in Hades is being in the kingdom of the dead. Till then, the Old Testament idea still holds of death, not as extinction, non-existence, or *not being* [see Genesis, Notes, pp. 273, 586], but as *a state*, a state of positive being, though strange and inexplicable,—a state of continued personality, real though undefined, utterly unknown as to its condition, or only conceived of negatively as something that differs, in almost every respect, from the present active, planning, toiling, pleasure-grasping, knowledge-seeking life "beneath the sun." That there is something strange about it, something difficult to be thought, is intimated in our Saviour's language respecting the Old Testament saints, Luke xx. 38. *πάντες γὰρ αὐτῷ ζῶσιν*, "for they all live unto Him" [unto God],—as though what was called their life was something out of them, and could only be made dimly conceivable to us by this remarkable language. Compare the Jewish expression as we find it, 1 Sam. xxv. 29, and as it is interpreted and often quoted by Rabbinical writers, צְרוּרָה בִּצְרוֹר הַחַיִּים "bound up in the bundle of life with Jehovah thy God," or as the Vulgate renders it—*anima custodita quasi in fasciculo viventium apud Dominum Deum tuum.*

There is yet a reserve to the doctrine of the immediate after life, still a veil cast over it, we may reverently say, even in the New Testament. The most modern notions of a sudden transition to the highest Heavens, and to the perfect life, are, perhaps, as far to the one extreme, as the descriptions of mortality which Koheleth gives us, in his gloomy mood, may be in the other. This idea of the dead passing straightway into a busy active state of existence, in these respects resembling the present life, with its proud talk of progress, was unknown to the early Church, as its liturgies and funeral hymns most evidently show. See especially the earliest Syriac hymns, much of whose language the modern notions would render almost unintelligible. Christ has indeed "brought immortality to light," but it is chiefly by the doctrine of the resurrection, that great article so clear in the New Testament, though having its shadow in the Old. But there is another doctrine there, however little it is studied. We are taught that there was a *work of Christ in Hades*. He descended into Hades; he makes proclamation [*ἐκήρυξεν*] in Hades (1 Pet. iii. 19) to those who are there "in ward." He is our Christian Hermes, belonging to both worlds. He is the *ψυχαγωγὸς*, the conductor and guide of redeemed spirits in Hades, the "*Shepherd* and Bishop of souls" (1 Pet. ii. 15), the "Good Shepherd" (Ps. xxiii.), who leads his spiritual flock beside the *still waters*, in the *Getzalmaveth*, the "valley of the death shade," or *terra umbrarum*, and, at the same time, the great High Priest above, to whom is "given all power in Heaven and in earth." He is the מלאך הגואל the Redeeming Angel of the Old Testament, to whom the righteous committed their spirits [Ps. xxxi. 6] and the Mediator more clearly revealed in the New.

The doctrine of the *immediate after life*, as we have said, has still a shadow cast upon it. We should not, therefore, wonder to find Koheleth still more under the veil. His very language implies *continuance of being*, in some way, although presenting a state of inactivity, and, in a word, a want of all participation in the doings and even memories of the present "life beneath the sun." It did not fall in the way of his musing to speak of differences, in this state, between the "righteous and the wicked;" but, in other passages of the Old Testament, it appears more clear, though still barely hinted, as in Prov. xiv. 32; Ps. lxxiii. 20; xlix. 15. It is a state in which the one is "driven away," whilst the other "has hope." Elsewhere, however [iii. 17: xii. 13, 14], Koheleth affirms his strong belief that at some time, and in some way, the two classes will be judged, and the difference between them most clearly manifested.

In the rhythmical version of ix. 10, חָכְמָה

Digitized by Google

is rendered *philosophy*, because the writer seems, in this place, to take it in its more pretentious sense, or for human wisdom in distinction from the Divine,—speculative inquiry,—very much as Paul uses σοφία, sometimes, in the New Testament. And so, perhaps, we would come nearer to the intended force of the other word דַּעַת by rendering *science*, although not exactly corresponding to it in the most modern acceptation of the term. It is Paul's γνῶσις, "curious knowledge,"—not mere knowing, as consciousness, whether Koheleth held to any such consciousness or not. Comp. it with חֶשְׁבּוֹן (*plan, reckoning*) in immediate connection. So, too, even when speaking of the perfect psychological state (1 Cor. xiii. 8) Paul says of *knowledge* (γνῶσις), καταργηθήσεται—not, "it shall cease," as rendered, but "it shall be deposed"—put one side—no longer made the highest thing, as in this fallen life, where the intellectual is placed above the moral nature. In the blessed and perfect life to come, moral or spiritual contemplation, pervaded by ἀγάπη, shall be the highest exercise of the soul. Even the intermediate state is to be regarded as superior to the present existence in ontological rank, and the terms *embryotic* or *rudimental*, if applied to it, must be taken simply as denoting a formative state of repose, preparatory to the more glorious life that follows.—T. L.]

[II. THE ALLEGED EPICUREANISM OF KOHELETH. NOTE on chap. ix. 7–10, in connection with chap. xi. 9, 10. These passages have given rise to much comment. Stuart, with many others, regards the first of them as expressing the real advice which Koheleth would give in regard to the conduct of life, and then says: "In all this there is nothing Epicurean." What then is Epicureanism? Or how shall we distinguish? It would seem to be almost too sober a word. The language here used may almost be characterized as Anacreontic: "Eat with joy thy bread, and drink with mirth thy wine,—thy garments always white, and oil ne'er lacking to thy head:"

> Πίνωμεν, ὦ πίνωμεν—
> Τὸ ῥόδον τὸ καλλίφυλλον
> Κροτάφοισιν ἁρμόσαντες.

How, then, shall we avoid what seems to be on the very face of the passage? It will not do to resort to any special interpretation on account of a mere exigentia loci; although it might, with perfect truth, be said, that such Anacreontic advice is not only contrary to all the more serious portions of the Scriptures, Old and New; but also to the deeply solemn views in regard to human vanities, and the great awaiting judgment, that Koheleth himself has, in other places, so clearly expressed. All this outward argument, however, would not justify us in calling it irony, unless there were some internal evidence, something in the very style of the passage which called for such a conclusion. A careful examination, made in the spirit of the whole book, shows that there are such internal grounds of criticism. It was a feeling of this that led Jerome, the most judicious of the Patristic commentators, to call it a προσωποποιία, a *personification*, or dramatizing, *more rhetorum et poetarum*, or what the Jewish critics (see p. 71) called "the case speaking," the language of human life and human actions, in view of the pure earthliness of its condition. It is the language of the author so far as he puts himself forth as the representative of such a despairing state: *quasi dixerit, O homo quia ergo, post mortem nihil es, dum vivis in hac brevi vita fruere voluptate, etc.*: "O man since, after death, thou art nothing, then, whilst thou livest thy short life, enjoy pleasure, indulge in feasts, drown thy cares in wine, go forth adorned in raiment ever white (a sign of perpetual joy), let fragrant odors be ever breathing from thy head; take thy joy in female loveliness (*quæcunque tibi placerent feminarum, ejus gaude complexu, et vanam hanc et brevem vitam vana et brevi voluptate percurre*) and in brief pleasure pass this thy brief life of vanity," *etc.* He then represents Koheleth as retracting all this in the passage immediately following, where he says, "*I turned again*, and saw that the race was not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong, nor wealth to the prudent, *etc.*," in other words, that thus to live in joy was not in man's power, but that all things happened as they were disposed by God: *Hæc, aliquis inquit, loquatur Epicurus et Aristippus, et ceteri pecudes philosophorum, ego autem (inquit Koheleth) mecum diligenter retractans, invenio non est velocium cursus, nec fortium prælium, etc., etc.*

There are two things in the passage itself that lead the serious reader to such a feeling, and such a view of its ironical, or, rather, its dramatic character. The first is the exuberance of the language, its extravagance, its Bacchanalian style, we might almost call it, inconsistent with, or certainly not demanded by, such a moderate, rational, sober view, or such a sober advice to live a contented life, as Stuart contends for, or, in other words, a judicious, virtuous Epicureanism. The joy so oft repeated, the mirth, the wine, the white raiment, the aromatic oils—what has such superlativeness of style to do with such a moderate, sober purpose? It was no more needed than the language which Euripides (Alcestis 800) puts into the mouth of Hercules when playing the Bacchanalian, and which this Solomonic irony so closely resembles:—

> Εὔφραινε σαυτὸν, πῖνε· τὸν καθ' ἡμέραν
> Βίον λογίζου σόν· τὰ δ' ἄλλα τῆς τύχης.
> Τίμα δὲ καὶ τὴν πλεῖστον ἡδίστην θεων.
> Οὔκουν, μεθ' ἡμῶν, τὴν λύπην ἄφεὶς, πίῃ,
> Στεφάνοις πυκασθεὶς κ. τ. λ.

> Make glad thy heart, drink wine, the life to-day
> Regard thine own; all else belongs to chance.
> In high esteem hold Love's delightful power.
> In social joy indulge—with chaplets crowned;
> And drive dull care away.

Hear Koheleth:

> Go then and eat with joy thy bread, and drink with mirth thy wine,
> In every season be thy garments white,
> And fragrant oil be never lacking to thy head;
> Live joyful with the wife whom thou hast loved.

The one kind of language seems but the echo of the other. If we disregard the spirit and the design of Koheleth, there is an Epicurean zest in his description, not surpassed, to say the least, by that of Euripides. We may say, too, on the other hand, that it is not easy to distinguish his language, and the spirit of it, from that of Paul in his quotation, 1 Cor. xv. 32: "Let us eat and

Digitized by Google

drink, for to-morrow we die." If it be said that the context there makes it impossible for us to mistake the Apostle's ironical meaning, the same may be said in respect to the writer who tells us, only a short distance back,

> Better to visit sorrow's house, than seek the banquet hall;
> Better is grief than mirth;
> For in the sadness of the face the heart becometh fair.

It is the very nature of rhetorical irony, especially if it be the irony of sorrowful warning, to paint the thing in higher colors, we may say, than would suit its description in a more direct and didactic admonition. Had it been a piece of Isocratean moralizing in commendation of a moderate, contented, frugal, and thankful enjoyment of life, it would naturally have been in a lower and calmer strain. The wine, the odors, the splendid raiment, would have been all wanting. They are just the points in the picture, however, to make an impression on the serious mind when it is felt to be a description of the vanity of life. We may even say that they are just the things that lead to such a feeling.

The second internal evidence showing the true character of this passage, is the feeling of sorrow, which, amidst all its apparent joyousness, the writer cannot suppress. We have called it irony, but the irony of the Bible is not only serious, but sometimes most tender. Whilst, then, the language here criticised is not the mere worldly advice that Stuart and others would represent, neither is it, on the other hand, the hard irony of sarcasm, or of unpitying satire. Koheleth's thoughts of death, and its awful unknown, have depressed his faith, and there seems to have come over him a feeling akin to despair. His idea of God's justice, and of some great destiny, or world, over and encompassing the present, is not lost—for it reappears strongly afterwards—but, for the moment, the thought of man, as he is seen in the earthly state, becomes predominant, and he breaks out in this strain, in which pity is a very manifest element. "Go then and enjoy thy poor life." There is strong feeling in it, a most tender compassion, and this shows itself in that touching mention of the transient human state, and, especially, in the pathetic repetition of the words

> The days of thy vain life,—that life
> Which God hath given to thee beneath the sun;
> Yea, all thy days of vanity.

This plaintive tone is utterly inconsistent with the Epicurean interpretation, however moral and decent we may strive to make it.

Again, there are two arguments against such a view that may be said to be outside of the passage itself, though one of them is derived from another place in the book. First—in chap. xi. 9, 10, we have a strain so precisely similar, in style and diction, that we cannot help regarding it as possessing the same rhetorical character. It may be thus given metrically, yet most literally, and with the full force of every Hebrew word:

> Rejoice O youth in childhood; let thy heart
> Still cheer thee in the day when thou art strong;
> Go on in every way thy will shall choose,
> And after every form thine eyes behold.

It is not easy to mistake the character of this, even if it were not followed by that most impressive warning:

> But know that for all this, thy God will thee to judgment bring:
> O then turn sorrow from thy soul, keep evil from thy flesh;
> For childhood and the morn of life, they, too, are vanity.

Here the caution is clearly expressed, although we feel that such expression is just what the previous words, rightly comprehended in their spirit, would have led us to expect. Rhetorically regarded, such an addition would have been exactly adapted to this place (ix. 7–10). It would have been in harmony with the tone of what had gone before. It is, however, so suggested by the whole spirit of the passage, and especially by that irrepressible tone of commiseration that appears in the words before cited (the pathetic allusion to our poor vain life), that it may well be a question whether any such distinct warning, or any mere moralizing utterance, could have had more power than the "expressive silence" which leaves it wholly to the feeling and conscience of the reader.

The passage xi. 9, 10, is so important in itself, and has such a bearing on the one before us, as to justify its fuller interpretation in this place. Many modern commentators regard these verses also as a *serious* advice to the young man, if the term *serious* could, with any propriety, be applied to such an admonition. The older commentators, however, are mostly the other way. They regarded the passage as indeed most *serious*, but as having this character from its sharp yet mournful irony. So GEIER says: "*magnam interpretum partem hæc verba imperativa ironice accipere.*" Among these were Kimchi, Munsterus, Mercerus, Drusius, Junius, Piscator, Cartwright, Cajetan, Vatablus, Ar. Montanus, Osorius, Mariana, Menoch, Pineda, Jac. Mathiæ, and others, among whom may be reckoned Tremellius, if we may judge from the tone and style of his Latin translation. Luther was the other way, and it may be said that he has given the tone to many that have come after him, evangelical as well as rationalist. "This is said seriously by Solomon," he tells us, "*de licita juventutis hilaritate*, concerning the permitted joyfulness of youth, which ought not to be unbridled, or lascivious, but restrained within certain limits." But what right has he to say this? What limits are assigned? The language seems wholly without limitations, or reserve: "Walk in the ways of thine heart, and in the sight of thine eyes," terms which every where else in the Hebrew Scriptures are used, in *malam partem*, to denote sensual and ungodly conduct; as in Numb. xv. 39: "Ye shall not go (roam) אַחֲרֵי לְבַבְכֶם וְאַחֲרֵי עֵינֵיכֶם after your own heart, and after your eyes." Compare also the frequent phrase שְׁרִירוּת לֵב, commonly rendered "the imagination of the heart," but really meaning the *turnings* (choices) of the heart,—doing as one pleases. See Deut. xxix. 18; Ps. lxxxi. 13 where it is synonymous with יֵלְכוּ בְּמֹעֲצוֹתֵיהֶם "walking in their own counsels," also Jerem. ix. 13, and other places. Compare especially Job xxxi. 7, where, for "the heart to follow the eye" is placed among the grievous sins, being regarded, in fact, as the very fountain-head of

Digitized by Google

sin: אִם אַחַר עֵינַי הָלַךְ לִבִּי, "if my heart hath gone after mine eyes," the *will* (the conscience) after the *choice*, the *velle* after the *optare*, the *voluntas* after the *voluptas*. "Walk in the way of thine heart;" what an admonition this to a young man, even if such a one ever needed an exhortation to hilarity, or to the following of his own pleasure! How strange, too, as coming from one who, in other parts of this book, talks so differently: "Better the house of mourning than the house of feasting;" "I said of laughter it is mad, of mirth, O what availeth it!" Compare it with the repeated charge of Solomon, in the Proverbs, to restrain the young man—not to let him go after the imaginations of his heart, to put a bridle on him (חנך Prov. xxii. 6), and "bow down his neck in his youth." The language here is peculiar, and each word must be sharply looked to: "Go on" (it is הַלֵּךְ, the piel intensive) "keep going, in the ways (all the ways, in the plural, every way) of thine heart," וּבְמַרְאֵי עֵינֶיךָ (the k'tib is undoubtedly right) and in (or after) the forms of thine eyes." The word מַרְאֶה is so frequently used of female beauty (see the phrase יְפַת מַרְאֶה Gen. xii. 11, and other places) that the idea is at once suggested here; and what a contrast then to our Saviour's teaching, that even to look is sin. What a contrast, we may say, is the whole of it thus considered, to what Christ says about the broad way, and to St. John's most emphatic language (1 Epist. ii. 16) respecting "the lust of the eye," the desire of the eye, τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν! If we give the phrase the more general rendering, "the sight of the eyes (sight objectively) it would come to the same thing It would be a license to follow every form of beauty. There might be urged, too, the contrast between it (thus regarded as serious advice even in the most decent sense that could be given to it) and Paul's counsel for young men, Titus ii. 6, τοὺς νεωτέρους παρακάλει σωφρονεῖν, "exhort them to be sober," temperate, sound-minded, having reason and conscience ruling over appetite and desire. How unlike, too, the Psalmist's direction cxix. 9, "Wherewith shall a young man cleanse his *way*,—by *taking heed* thereto (לִשְׁמֹר), by watching it, according to Thy word." How utterly opposed to this is the unlimited advice to the young man "to walk in the way of his heart," that is, to do as he pleases. Luther feels the force of this contrast, for he says in the same comment, when he comes to speak of the words ותלך בדרכי לבך "walk in the ways of thine heart," *fecit hic locus ut totum hunc textum ironiam esse putarem, quia ferme in malam partem sonat, siquis incedat in via cordis sui:* "This place would make me think that the whole text was irony, because the phrase 'to walk in the way of one's heart,' is so generally taken in a bad sense." But, after all, he goes on to say that we must abide by the general idea of the passage (as he had taken it) and suppose the necessary limitations. Very few commentators have had a clearer perception than Luther of the general sense of the Scripture, but in regard to such passages as these he is not to be implicitly trusted. He was of a very jovial disposition; but what chiefly led him to such interpretations, here and elsewhere in this book, was his aversion to some of the more austere dogmas, as well as practices of Romanism, and especially his dislike of asceticism, as exhibited by the Monks. Hence he allowed himself too much to be driven towards the opposite extreme. Thus in his commenting on the words במראה עיניך, "in the sight of thine eyes," he boldly says, *quod offertur oculis tuis hoc fruere, ne fias similis Monachorum, etc.:* "whatever is offered to your eyes, that freely enjoy, lest you become like the monks who would not have one even look at the sun." And so in the beginning of the passage, ver. 9: *non prohibet jucunditates sive voluptates, quemadmodum stulti monachi fecerunt, etc.:* "It does not prohibit delights nor pleasures, as the foolish monks have done, which is nothing else than making stocks of young men (even as Anselm says, *ille monachissimus monachus*, that most monkish monk), or than attempting to plant a tree in a narrow pot." Others of the Reformers and early Protestant commentators were influenced in the same way in following Luther, and there can be no doubt that this has much affected their interpretations of Koheleth, making him talk like an Epicurean, and then denying that it was Epicureanism, or trying to throw over it a decent ethical mantle by their unwarranted hypotheses and limitations. After they have done their best, however, in this way, they make this writer of Holy Scripture to be a moralist inferior to Socrates and Seneca, who certainly never thought that a young man needed any such advice as that. The pious Geier seems to be aware of the suggestions that might arise from other parts of Scripture, and would zealously guard this virtuous Solomonic young man, who needs such a caution against excessive sobriety, from any comparison with the Prodigal Son, Luke xv. But what did he do, that *filius perditus*, that spendthrift, *ille heluo*, as Geier calls him, except "to walk in the ways of his heart, and in the sight of his eyes?" What is all pleasure-seeking selfishness [φιλαυτία, φιληδονία, 2 Tim. iii. 2–4] but saying "give unto me *my* portion of *goods* that falleth to me," in this world?

It might have been thought, however, that the latter part of ver. 10, following the warning of judgment, would have been treated in a different manner; but the general consistency of which Luther speaks has led some to an Epicurean interpretation even of this. We regret to find our author Zöckler following such a course in his interpretation of the words הסר כעס מלבך "turn away sorrow from thy heart." "Here," he says, "the positive exhortation to hilarity (*Frölichsein*) is followed by a dissuasion from its opposite,"—that is, the young man is told to avoid seriousness as painful and troublesome (*Kummer, Unmuth,*) which he gives as the interpretation of כַּעַס]. It is a recommendation of hilarity, of mirth, in opposition to asceticism or undue sobriety, as though the young man's danger in Solomon's time, or in the days of Malachi, or at any other period in the human history, had been in that direction of gloom and monkery.

Digitized by Google

There are few interpreters more honest, or more learned, than STUART, and yet his comment here is certainly a very strange one. "In verse 9th," he tells us, "the command is to do something positive in the way of enjoyment; here it is to shun evil and suffering. Taking both together, the amount is, enjoy all that a rational man can enjoy in view of retribution, and avoid all the evil and suffering that can be avoided." Retribution here is a mere make weight. Why retribution for simply acting according to the advice? If *pleasure* be the *good*, then, as that acute moralist SOCRATES says, "he who gets the most of it is the ἀγαθὸς ἀνήρ, the *good* man, the best man." "But why," asks STUART, "is this so strongly urged upon the young?" The question is certainly one that is very naturally suggested in view of such an interpretation, but the answer he gives is remarkable: "Plainly because that even they, although in the best estate of man, hold life by a very frail tenure. Therefore, as even youth is so frail and evanescent, make the best of it. It is almost as if he had said—Then or never." In other words, a short life and a merry one. ANACREON could not have said it better. No exhortation to obedience to parents, to temperance, to sober-mindedness, in the style of Paul, no advice to "watch over the heart," such as Solomon gives in the Proverbs, but a direction "to walk in the sight of the eyes," and a caution against seriousness as inconsistent with youthful hilarity. Strange advice this under any circumstances; and still more strange from the fact that it is the only place in the book in which young men are addressed,—the first verse of chap. xii. being but a continuation of the admonition here given. Look at the argument as it thus presents itself: God will bring thee unto judgment, young man; therefore put away all serious concern from thy heart. And why? Because youth is brief and evanescent. How does it compare Scripturally with the other view as presenting the other reasoning: Know that God will bring thee into judgment for "following the ways of thine heart, and walking in the sight of thine eyes;" therefore "turn sorrow from thy heart" [thy soul], that is the feeling of remorse, the sense of the Divine displeasure, or of thine own self-accusing indignation [כַּעַס] for such an unrestrained living to thyself, and "keep off [הַעֲבֵר, avert] evil from thy flesh"—that is, the bodily ills that must come from a life of sensuality, or following "the desire of thy heart," and "the voluptuous sight of thine eyes." And why? Because "childhood and youth [שַׁחֲרוּת, literally, the morn of life] are vanity;" that is, all their joys, take them at the highest, are vain and worthless in comparison with the serious evils, whether for this life or another, that such a course of free indulgence may bring upon thee.

The ironical nature of this passage is accepted by that great critic, GLASSIUS, in the *Philologia Sacra*, p. 1518. It is an "apostrophe," he says, "*a concessio ironica cujus correctio, a consuetudine animi et sensuum prava revocans, statim subjungitur:*" Go on,—but know. He compares it with Isaiah ii. 10, "enter into the rock, and hide thyself in the dust," but know that God will find thee. So Isaiah viii. 9, "Join yourselves together, enter into council, but know that it will be all in vain." It is equivalent to saying, "*though* ye do this,"—the imperative being really the statement of an hypothesis. Another passage he cites is Isaiah xxi. 5: "Spread the table, set the watch, eat, drink," *etc.;* though that may be taken in a different way.

A second outside proof of the true character of the language, Eccles. ix. 7-10, is derived from a passage in the Apocryphal book entitled Wisdom of Solomon. It is evidently an imitation of these very verses, and, whether written by a Jew or a Christian, is evidence of the earliest mode of interpreting all such modes of speaking in Koheleth. It is the language of the worldly pleasure-seeker, chap. ii. vers. 6-8: "Come then, and let us enjoy the good that is before us; let us be filled with costly wine and aromatic odors; let no flower of the spring pass by us; let us crown ourselves with roses before they be withered," *etc.* The imitation is evident throughout the passage. It appears not only from the language used, but also from the fact that the writer, both by his general style and by the title he has given to his book, intended it as a more full and florid setting forth of what he deemed the pervading thought and feeling of Koheleth. Now, by placing this same style of language in the mouth of the sensualist, he makes clear that he was of like opinion with JEROME (whose views may have been derived from his Hebrew teacher representing the same view afterwards advanced by Kimchi), that as uttered by Koheleth, it was a *προσωποποιία*, a dramatic representing of what is expressed in human action,—the sensualist's own conduct speaking forth the view of life that would be in accordance with the idea that this is all of man, and that there is no such judgment as that on which Koheleth elsewhere so strongly insists. This is rendered still more clear from the sudden change that immediately follows in ver. 11, and which JEROME justly characterizes as Koheleth *retractans.* He cannot let the language go without showing how full of vanity it is, viewed only in regard to the present world, and according to the known condition of human life:

I turned again to look beneath the sun.
Not to the swift the race, I saw, nor victory to the strong,
Nor to the wise secure their bread, nor to the prudent
wealth.

The very uncertainty of all human efforts renders such advice utterly vain. Why say to men, be happy, eat, drink, and be merry, "let thy garments be ever white, and let aromatic oils be never lacking to thy head," when no strength, no wisdom, can give any security for the avoidance of sorrow, much less for the attainment of such Epicurean joys. In such a connection the thought of there being, necessarily for man, a judgment and a destiny, making all such pleasures, even if innocent, mere vanity and worthlessness in the comparison, is more powerfully suggested than it would have been by the most express utterance.

There are some other things of less exegetical importance, but deserving of attention in their bearing on the real character of these important passages. Thus the words כִּי כְּבָר רָצָה

הָאֱלֹהִים אֶת־מַעֲשֶׂיךָ [ix. 7] are rendered in E. V.: "God now accepteth thy works," indicating that He has, in some way, become gracious. The true rendering is, "God hath already," or rather, "long ago, accepted thy works." It is a thing of the past, settled as the Divine way in regard to man; He has never been offended at all. It is the doctrine of Plato's second class of atheists (as he calls them, though they claim to be theists), who believe in a Divine power, but regard Him as taking no account of men, or rather, as accepting all human works, as He accepts the operations of nature. Or it is a Hebraistic form of the Lucretian doctrine of the Divine nature:

Semota ab nostris rebus, sejunctaque longe.

That this general acceptance by Deity of human works is not the serious language of Koheleth, is evident from his so frequent insisting on judgment, either in this world or in another, as though it were his favorite doctrine, his "one idea," we might say, in all this discourse. So WORDSWORTH regards the whole passage as the language of the sensualist (which is the same as JEROME's ironical προσωποποιία, or Koheleth speaking in their person), and thus comments on the words in question: "Evil men misconstrue their prosperity into a sign that God accepts their works." There is, however, too much inferential moralizing in such a statement. In *their* language, God's "accepting their works" is rather another mode of saying that He is utterly indifferent about them, or, as they would represent in their Lucretian hyperpiety, too great, too exalted, to mind the affairs of men.

The 10th verse of ch. ix. is rendered in E. V.: "Whatever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might." The Vulgate favors this, but the accents forbid it. They connect בכחך with לעשות, requiring us, if we follow them, to render: "whatever thy hand findeth to do in thy strength, do it." This puts a different aspect upon the sentence, and the accents, with their usual nice discrimination, bring it out. The other rendering would indeed suggest a similar meaning, but the accents make it clear. It becomes the maxim, τὸ κράτιστον τὸ δίκαιον, might makes right, or let might be thy law of right, or as it is rendered in the Metrical Version,—

Do, then, whate'er thy hand shall find in thy own might to do.

WORDSWORTH takes the same view: "Do all that thy hand findeth to do by thy power" [see HENGSTENBERG, EWALD]; that is, "let might be right with thee; care nothing for God or man, but use thy strength according to thy will." Surely this is not the serious language of the serious Koheleth, the earnest teacher of judgment, who speaks so solemnly of "the fear of God, and who says, only two verses from this: "Then I turned again to look beneath the sun, and saw that the race was not to the swift nor the victory to the strong."

The language following: "For there is no knowledge," *etc.*, even STUART regards as that of the objector, though replying to the serious advice given above, as though he had said in addition: enjoy thyself, *etc.*, for there is no after state to give thee uneasiness. "But we have seen," says STUART, "that the settled opinion of Koheleth himself [viii. 12, 13] was something quite different from this." It is not easy to understand the remark. It would have furnished STUART a much more consistent ground of reasoning, had he regarded the whole passage as irony or personification. He says, at the close of his comment on the verses: "The positive passages which show Koheleth's view of judgment, and of retribution, are too strong to justify us in yielding to suggestions of this nature"—that is, the supposition of his denial of all future accountability. This rule of criticism, had they consistently followed it, would have made Koheleth all clear in many places where the opposite method produces inextricable confusion and contradiction.

Such remarks as ZÖCKLER and STUART sometimes make in deprecation of Epicureanism [HITZIG, in general, gives himself no concern about it] show the pressure upon evangelical commentators (and even upon all who may in a true sense be styled rational), when they adopt what may be termed the half-way Lutheran mode. The doctrine of Epicurus, even in its most decent form, is so inconsistent with any devout *fear of God*, and this again is so utterly alien to any philosophic or scientific theism that maintains a Deity indifferent to human conduct, one who cannot be prayed to, ἀνευκταῖος, and without any judgment either in this world or another; for in respect to the true nature of Koheleth's exhortation, either idea presents a conclusive argument. His doctrine must be somehow connected with all that system of truth, with all that "wisdom, of which the fear of the Lord is the beginning." To a mind deeply meditative like that of Koheleth, the thought of there being no judgment, no hereafter (should such a belief be ever forced upon it), would not be ground of joy, much less of an exhortation to joy, as addressed to others. He would not, even in that case, adopt the Epicurean maxim: Let us eat and drink,—rather let us fast, let us mourn, in view of an existence so brief, so full of vanity, so soon to go out in darkness all the more dense, a despair all the more painful, in consequence of the transient light of reason with which we are so strangely and irrationally endowed—*e tenebris in tenebras*—like the bubble on the wave in a stormy night, reflecting for a moment all the starry hosts above, and then going out forever. There is no religion, no superstition, no creed so awfully serious, as that of human extinction, and of a godless world. Place the two exhortations side by side: Live in the fear of God, for thou must come to judgment: Live joyful, for soon thou wilt be no more; in either alternative, the present value of the present being, considered for its own sake, dwindles in a rational estimate. As connected with a greater life to come, though made important by such connection, yet how *comparatively* poor! regarded as the whole of our existence, how *absolutely* vain! In the first aspect, it is *vanitas*; in the second, it is *vanitas vanitatum*, utterly vain, a "vanity of vanities." The Epicurean idea and the Epicurean call to mirth are as inconsistent with the one as with the other.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

B.—In Presence of the Insolence, Bold Assumption and Violence of Fortunate and Influential Fools, the Wise Man can only Preserve his Peace of Soul by Patience, Silence and Tranquility.

CHAP. IX. 17—X. 20.

1. Of the advantage of a wise tranquility over the presumptuous insolence of fools.

(IX. 17—X. 4.)

17 The words of wise *men are* heard in quiet more than the cry of him that ruleth
18 among fools. Wisdom *is* better than weapons of war: but one sinner destroyeth
1 much good. Dead flies cause the ointment of the apothecary to send forth a stink-
ing savour: *so doth* a little folly him that is in reputation for wisdom *and* honour.
2, 3 A wise man's heart *is* at his right hand; but a fool's heart *is* at his left. Yea
also, when he that is a fool walketh by the way, his wisdom faileth *him*, and he
4 saith to every one *that* he *is* a fool. If the spirit of the ruler rise up against thee,
leave not thy place; for yielding pacifieth great offences.

2. Of the advantage of quiet, modest wisdom over the externally brilliant but inconstant fortune of fools.

(VERS. 5–10.)

5 There is an evil *which* I have seen under the sun, as an error *which* proceedeth
6, 7 from the ruler: Folly is set in great dignity, and the rich sit in low place. I
have seen servants upon horses, and princes walking as servants upon the earth.
8 He that diggeth a pit shall fall into it; and whoso breaketh an hedge, a serpent
9 shall bite him. Whoso removeth stones shall be hurt therewith; *and* he that
10 cleaveth wood shall be endangered thereby. If the iron be blunt, and he do not
whet the edge, then must he put to more strength: but wisdom *is* profitable to
direct.

3. Of the advantage of the silence and persevering industry of the wise man over the loquacity and indolence of fools.

(VERS. 11-20.)

11 Surely the serpent will bite without enchantment; and a babbler is no better.
12 The words of a wise man's mouth *are* gracious; but the lips of a fool will swallow
13 up himself. The beginning of the words of his mouth *is* foolishness: and the end
14 of his talk *is* mischievous madness. A fool also is full of words: a man cannot
15 tell what shall be; and what shall be after him, who can tell him? The labour
of the foolish wearieth every one of them, because he knoweth not how to go to
16 the city. Wo to thee, O land, when thy king *is* a child, and thy princes eat in the
17 morning! Blessed *art* thou, O land, when thy king *is* the son of nobles, and thy
18 princes eat in due season, for strength, and not for drunkenness! By much sloth-
fulness the building decayeth; and through idleness of the hands the house drop-
19 peth through. A feast is made for laughter, and wine maketh merry: but money
20 answereth all *things*. Curse not the king, no, not in thy thought; and curse not
the rich in thy bed-chamber: for a bird of the air shall carry the voice, and that
which hath wings shall tell the matter.

*[V. 8. גּוּמָּץ. A *ditch*, or *pit*, *Vulg.*, *fovea*, LXX. *βόθρον*. The Syriac Version has the same word. It is, however, no more Aramaic than Hebrew, being rare in both languages, though the verb, signifying to *dig*, is found in the latter. Its form is unusual in having dagesh after shurek, as is noted in the margin.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

[Ver. 9. יִסָּכֶן; for יִשָּׂכֶן, a denominative from שַׂכִּין, "a knife," and, therefore, having no relation to the verb סכן as found, with quite a different meaning Job xxii. 2; xxxiii. 3; xv. 3; Isaiah xxii. 15, *etc.* Lit., "shall be cut," or, "may be cut thereby." It is another example of variant orthography, showing that the first manuscripts of this work were written from the ear. See remarks on שִׂכְלוּת and similar words, page 116.—T. L.]

[Ver. 10. קִלְקַל; the sense of *swinging*, which Zöckler, Hitzig, and Elster give to this word, is not confirmed by Ezek. xxi. 26, to which they refer. Gesenius gives the sense to *sharpen*, *polish*, but derives it from the primary idea of *light moving*, as in the rapid motions of a whet-stone, which is very probable. The accents connect it with פָנִים *faces*, *edges*, though the *Vulgate* and LXX have disregarded it.—T. L.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Of the three sections of this division, as we lay them down in essential conformity with Vaihinger, the first compares the entire nature of the wise man with that of the fool, whilst the second draws a parallel between the two regarding the conditions of their happiness; but the third points out the more profound* causes of their opposite destinies in two special qualities of both (the loquacity and indolence of fools, and the opposite of these faults in the wise man). This train of thought is less clear on account of the peculiar form of the sentences,—nearly all being proverbs of two lines, concise in extent, and significant and aphoristic in character;—but it must not therefore be disregarded, nor displaced by the acceptance of an incongruity of plan or connection, as if it were a conglomerate of many groups of maxims or of separate proverbs with no internal connection. By an atomistic and disintegrating process, this section has been divided by Hengstenberg into five divisions, by Hahn into eight, and by Elster even into nine; (1) ix. 17—x. 1; (2) x. 2, 3; (3) ver. 4; (4) vers. 5–7; (5) vers. 8–10; (6) vers. 11–14; (7) ver. 15; (8) vers. 16–19; (9) ver. 20; we shall present the special refutation of this system in our illustrations of the words and sense of the individual verses.

2. *First strophe.* Chap. ix. 17—x. 4. Of the patient and tranquil nature of the wise man in contrast with the arrogant insolence and irascibility of the fool.—**The words of wise men are heard in quiet more than the cry of him that ruleth among fools.** Observe the connection with the section immediately preceding, vers. 13–16, which shows the superiority of wisdom by a single example. But this verse opens a new section in so far as it begins to treat specifically of tranquility as a characteristic and cardinal virtue of the wise man. He who hears in quiet, proves himself thereby a lover of quiet and tranquility, and therefore a wise man. A quiet attention to wise words is a condition necessary to their practical obedience, and consequently to becoming wise and acting wisely. The counterpart of this is shown by the boisterous and passionate cry of the "*ruler among fools*," *i. e.*, not absolutely of the "foolish ruler" (Vaihinger, *etc.*, referring to Ps. liv. 6; Job xxiv. 13, ff.), but of a ruler who, as he rules over fools, is foolish himself; comp. chap. x. 16. Elster correctly observes: "Two pictures are here compared, the wise man among his scholars, who receive his teachings with collected attention, and thoughtful quiet, and a ruler wanting in wisdom to control, and who, in undignified and boisterous ostentation, issues injudicious commands to those who execute them quite as

* [These ethical and logical divisions are not easy to trace. The different methods adopted by different commentators, warrant a strong suspicion of their reality. There is, doubtless, a connection in the thought, but it is poetical rather than logical, suggestive rather than formally didactic. In the Metrical Version there is an attempt to group into separate cantos the thoughts that seemed to have the nearest relation to each other; but these might, perhaps, be differently arranged, and with equal effect. The mind of the author may be regarded under different aspects. And so, too, of the reader, it may be said, that the division for him may depend very much on his own spiritual state: for it is the very nature of all such musing, emotional writing, to suggest more to one mind than to another. It may even give a wider and a higher train of thought to the reader than the writer himself possessed: and that too legitimately, or without any violence to the text; for there is *a spirit in words* witnessing with our *spirits*, and, under favorable spiritual circumstances, there may be seen a light in our author's language which he did not see, or but dimly saw, himself. And this we may suppose to have been the very design of the higher or divine author, in giving such a dramatic or representative work a place in His holy written revelation. The whole book is a *meditation*, or a series of meditations. The thoughts do not, indeed, follow each other arbitrarily; but, like our best thinking, are connected more by emotional than by logical bands. Place ourselves in the same subjective state—read it as poetry, not as a formal didactic ethical treatise—and we shall readily see what there is in each part, in each verse, in a single word sometimes, that makes the writer think of what follows, though all logical, or even rhetorical criticism might fail to find it. (See remarks p. 176). Take, for example, these verses of the ix. and x. chapters, as apparently the most disconnected of any in the whole poem. The ever-recurring, or underlying thought is wisdom in its two apparently contradictory aspects of *preciousness* and *vanity*—wisdom, of such inestimable value in itself as compared with folly, and yet, through folly, rendered so unavailing. The episodal mention of "the poor wise man" leads on the general train of thought, but it immediately suggests (ver. 7) how one sinner (one fool) may destroy its effect upon a community. This prompts the parallel thought, how, in the individual, too, a little folly taints all his better acquisitions,—the mode of expressing this being, doubtless, a favorite proverbial form commending itself less for its nicety than for its exquisite appositeness. This again makes him think how readily the fool exposes his folly; as the most striking example of which there occurs to the mind the rashness with which such bring upon themselves the displeasure of the ruler. Then comes readily up the folly of rulers themselves,—then examples of it in subverting the proper relations of life. A pause, perhaps, occurs; some links pass silently through the mind, but the chain of thought still shows itself. It is transferred from the higher to the more ordinary avocations of life. It is still the unavailingness of human wisdom. With all our care, and all our skill, there is danger everywhere, liability to mistakes and mishaps in every business, and in every act. Another pause; it is the same thought but it takes a different form—the unavailingness of eloquence, or the gift of speech [that splendid evil, ὁ κόσμος τῆς ἀδικίας, Jas. iii. 6, or "ornament of unrighteousness"]. Here, too, there is to be traced the influence of the proverbial association: "the serpent bites without enchantment;" so is the gift of speech to its possessor when misemployed in vain babbling or in slander. In such a tracking of ideas and emotions, the transitions may seem slight and even fanciful; but they are more natural, more sober, more impressive, we may say, in their moral and didactic effect, than those formal, logical divisions which commentators so confidently propose, and in which they so greatly differ. Other readers may be differently affected, so that they discover in it other associations of thought [for there are various ways, lying below the soul's direct consciousness, in which our spiritual movements link themselves together] but such diversity of view, it may be said, arises from the very nature of this kind of subjective writing, and is evidence of excellency in it rather than of a defect. It comes from its very suggestiveness, and shows the rich fertility inherent in its germs of thought.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

injudiciously. Comp. the mild and tranquil nature of the servant of God, with the criers in the streets: Isa. xlii. 2; Matt. xii. 19.—Ver. 18. **Wisdom is better than weapons of war;** *i. e.*, it is stronger, more effective, and indomitable than the greatest physical strength and warlike preparation, קְרָב poetical, and equivalent to מִלְחָמָה comp. Ps. lv. 19; Dan. vii. 21; and therefore, כְּלֵי־קְרָב as elsewhere we have כְּלֵי מִלְחָמָה, not merely weapons of war (*Vulgate: arma bellica;* ELSTER, *et al.*), but implements of war, warlike instruments, and apparatus, war material in general (LXX σκεύη πολέμου).—**But one sinner destroyeth much good.** "One sinner," *i. e.*, a single one of those coarse miscreants or fools, who can command physical strength, but are destitute of wisdom. There certainly can be no intention to make a special allusion to the "heathen world-monarch," *i. e.*, the Persian king (HENGSTENBERG), nor in the expression, "much good" is there any reference to the prosperity of the Persian realm. This expression טוֹבָה הַרְבֵּה can rather be only intended to show what is homogeneous with wisdom and belonging to it, consequently the salutary creations and measures of wisdom, its blessings in the various spheres of the civil, and, especially, of the moral life of men.—Nine manuscripts read וְחֵטְא instead of וְחוֹטֶא "and *one sin* destroyeth much good;" but the connection imperatively demands the retention of the Masoretic reading. —Chap. x. 1. **Dead flies cause the ointment of the apothecary to send forth a stinking savour.** Literal, "flies of death," *etc.* The singular יַבְאִישׁ, with the plural זְבוּבֵי, is to be taken distributively: each individual dead fly can make the ointment stink, as soon as it falls into it. For this construction comp. Hosea iv. 8; Prov. xvi. 2; Song of Solomon ii. 9; GESENIUS, *Lehrgebäude*, pp. 665, 713. יַבִּיעַ means literally "turns into liquid, causes to bubble up," *i. e.*, sets into fermentation, and in that way produces the decomposition and rottenness of the ointment. רוֹקֵחַ, dealer in spices. This addition gives us to understand that the valuable ointment of commerce is meant, and by no means a worthless article.—**So doth a little folly him that is in reputation for wisdom and honor.** [ZÖCKLER'S comment is based upon his translation: "Weightier than wisdom, than honor, is a little folly,"* which is essentially different from our English Version.—T. L.] יָקָר is here used in its original signification "heavy, weighty," namely, in the eyes of the dazzled multitude, that is, accustomed to esteem folly, and indeed a very small amount of folly, of more value than all real wisdom and honor. "Wisdom and honor" correspond in this second clause to the costly ointment of the first, and the "little folly" (כִּמְעַט) corresponds to the fly, the little dead animal, that nevertheless corrupts the whole pot of ointment; comp. 1 Cor. v. 6.—Ver. 2. After ver. 1 has explained and developed the second clause of ix. 18, the author turns back to the illustration of the great advantages of wisdom over folly, that is, to the first clause of ix. 18. **A wise man's heart is at his right hand.** That is, it is in the right place, whilst the fool's is really at the left, *i. e*, has sinister and perverse purposes. "Heart" is here equivalent to judgment, as in the subsequent verse, and in Prov. ii. 2; xiv. 33; xv. 28.—Ver. 3. **Yea also, when he that is a fool walketh by the way, his wisdom faileth him.** That is, when he goes out he lets people perceive his want of judgment in various ways—for which reason he would do much better to remain at home with his stupidity.—**And he saith to every one that he is a fool.** Namely, because he considers himself alone wise, and as a fool he can do no otherwise; for as soon as he should consider himself a fool, he would have made the beginning of his return to the path of wisdom. KNOBEL, EWALD, and VAIHINGER render; "it is foolish." But סָכָל stands elsewhere only for persons; for the adjective sense it would be necessary to assume the reading סֶכֶל.—Ver. 4 is not a specific maxim incidentally dropped, (ELSTER) but an admonition holding the closest connection with what precedes, and which forms the practical conclusion of the whole discussion (beginning with ix. 17) concerning the relation between wise gentleness and foolish passionateness. For the ruler among fools (ix. 17) here

---

*[The objections to the rendering of ZÖCKLER, HITZIG, STUART, and others, are 1st: the unusual meaning "*heavier*," which it gives to יָקָר, a sense existing primarily in the root, and appearing in the Syriac and the Arabic, but having no other example in the Hebrew; 2d, the filling up, or supposed ellipsis ("in the eyes of the ignorant and foolish"), which is required if we give it the more common Hebrew significance of "precious, honorable;" 3d, and chiefly, the singular incongruity that, by either of these authors, is introduced into the comparison: "as the dead fly *taints* the precious ointment, so a little folly *outweighs* wisdom," *etc.*, or, is more precious in the vulgar opinion. It is evidently a comparison in either rendering, though the particle of comparison is omitted, as in many other cases, especially of the concise sententious kind [see the long list in the Grammar of JONA BEN GANNACH]. The objection to the common English rendering (which is also that of GEIER, TREMELLIUS, and the great critic GLASSIUS) is that it requires a repetition of יַבְאִישׁ in the second member; but for such ellipsis, especially in proverbial expressions, and when the context evidently favors it, there is good and clear authority. Comp. Prov. xiii. 2: "From the fruit of his mouth a man shall *eat* good, but the soul of the wicked—folly;" that is, shall *eat* folly [with ellipsis of תֹּאכַל]. Comp. Prov. xxvi. 9; Jerem. xvii. 11. A still stronger case is found, Job xxiv. 19, where there is, in fact, a double ellipsis. and yet the comparison and the meaning are both quite clear: "Heat carries off the snow waters, Sheol—have sinned;" that is, so "sheol (carries off those that) have sinned"—שאול חטאו. There is an ellipsis both of the governing verb, and of the relative pronoun. "The dead fly *taints* the fragrant ointment, so a little folly [taints] one honorable for wisdom," *etc.* Nothing could be more apt. or true. This rendering preserves also the analogy between a *good name* and *precious odors*, a metaphor common in all languages, and so strikingly introduced vii. 1, and Cant. i. 3: Dead flies spoil the fragrant ointment, a little folly the good name. This is in accordance, too, with a common usage in Hebrew, by which the sense of הִבְאִישׁ is transferred from the literal *ill savor* to odiousness of character. The preposition מ with the sense of *propter*, *on account of*, is also well established: יָקָר מֵחָכְמָה מִכָּבוֹד, "precious," that is, held in esteem "for wisdom and honor." The two verbs יַבִּיעַ and יַבְאִישׁ are to be taken together, or the one as qualifying the other: "make corrupt, make ferment," or froth, that is, corrupt by fermentation—"with frothy taint." See Metrical Version.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

clearly appears again as "ruler;" the "great offences" point back to the "sinner" of ix. 18; and thus also is there made a close connection with vers. 2 and 3 of this chapter. Hence LUTHER is correct in his rendering: "*Therefore*, when the insolence of a mighty one," *etc.* **If the spirit of the ruler rise up against thee.** For the expression רוּחַ תַּעֲלֶה עַל in which רוּחַ does not mean spirit (*Sept.*, *Vulg.*, HENGSTENBERG), but anger, comp. 2 Sam. xi. 12; Ps. lxxviii. 21; Ezek. xxxviii. 18.—**Leave not thy place**; *i. e.*, do not be disconcerted, do not become dissatisfied, as this would develop itself in a changed position of thy body in a manner that would entail danger on thee. In this obvious illustration it is not necessary, with HITZIG, to explain מְקוֹמְךָ by "thy condition of soul, thy usual state of mind,"—an interpretation for which the appeal to the soul—"maintain thy place"—in the Arabian story of the "Golden Necklace," scarcely affords a sufficient reason.—**For yielding pacifieth great offences**, *i. e.*, prevents them, smothers them in the birth, and does not let them come to light. We find similar sentences in Prov. x. 12; xv. 1; xxv. 15.

8. *Second strophe.* Vers. 5–10. Of the apparent but inconstant fortune of fools, and of the superiority of the modest, but effective and sterling influence of wisdom.—For ver. 5, first clause, comp. chap. vi. 1.—**As an error which proceedeth from the ruler.** By the comparative כְּ in כִּשְׁגָגָה, the evil in the first clause is marked as one that is not simply an error of a ruler, but which only appears as such, manifests itself as such, so as to draw after it much worse evils, (EWALD is correct in translating, "apparently in error"). We can also understand this כְּ as כְּ veritatis, and either leave it untranslated (as ELSTER, according to LUTHER and many older authors) or give it through our turn: "there is an evil in respect to an error" (HITZIG); it is then indicated that the particular action in question corresponds to the general idea of an evil (רָעָה); compare 2 Sam. ix. 8.—The explanations of KNOBEL, VAIHINGER, and HAHN are censurable in making כְּ equivalent to the expressions "according to, or in consequence of which;" as are also those of HENGSTENBERG, who, following the example of HIERONYMUS and a Jewish adept in Scripture learning whom he questioned, understands the term "ruler" (הַשַּׁלִּיט) to be God, and thence thinks of an act of divine power that seems like a fault, but is none,—an interpretation which is untenable on account of the manifest identity of שַׁלִּיט with מוֹשֵׁל in ver. 4.—Vers. 6 and 7 give two examples of errors of rulers.—**Folly is set in great dignity**; namely, by the caprice of a ruler who elevates an unworthy person to the highest honors of his realm. נִתַּן lit., "is given, is set," comp. Esther vi. 8; Deut. xvii. 15. The abstract הַסֶּכֶל stands for the concrete סָכָל which the *Septuagint*, *Vulgate*, *etc.*, seem to have read directly, but which is not therefore to be put in the place of the Masoretic text, because the latter gives a much stronger thought; it is not simply a fool, it is personified folly.—**And the rich sit in low place**, *i. e.*, by virtue of those very despotic acts of a despotic ruler, the rich (*i. e.*, the noble and distinguished, whose wealth is patrimonial and just,) *homines ingenuos nobiles* (comp. ver. 20, as also the synonym בְנֵי־חוֹרִים ver. 17) are robbed of their possessions and driven from their high places. HITZIG says: "Sudden and immense changes of fortune proceeding from the person of the ruler are peculiar to the East, the world of despotism, where barbers become ministers, and confiscations of large fortunes and oppression of possessors are the order of the day."—Ver. 7. **I have seen servants upon horses, and princes walking as servants upon the earth.** A contrast to sitting on horseback, which, among the Hebrews was considered a distinction for the upper classes. Comp. 2 Chron. xxv. 28; Esther vi. 8, 9; Jer. xvii. 25; and to this add Justinian xli. 8: "*Hoc denique discrimen inter servos liberosque est, quod servi pedibus, liberi non nisi equis incedunt.*" Here also, as in the preceding verse, the persons compared are to be considered as contrasted not merely in their external condition but also in their character; the princes are really princely, and princely-minded persons, but the servants are men with base servile feeling, which qualifies and makes it right for them to serve.—Vers. 8-10 show that in spite of this sudden elevation, so easily gained by unworthy and foolish persons, their lot is by no means to be envied; because their fortune is rife with dangers, because the intrigues by means of which they excluded their predecessors from their possessions, can easily overthrow them, and because the difficult tasks that devolve on them in their high offices can easily bring upon them injury and disgrace. Wherefore genuine wisdom, of internal worth and business-like capacity, is far preferable to such externally brilliant but unreliable and inconstant fortune of fools. The close connection between these verses and vers. 5-7 is correctly perceived by HITZIG, HENGSTENBERG and HAHN, whilst ELSTER and VAIHINGER isolate their contents too much in wishing to find nothing farther in them than a warning against rebellion, or resistance to divine command.—**He that diggeth a pit shall fall into it.** This is different from Ps. vii. 15; Prov. xxvi. 27; Sirach xxvii. 26; it is not a pit *for others*, but simply a pit, the result of severe exertion of a dangerous character, with the implements for digging. Falling into the pit is not presented as a necessary, but only as a very possible case.—**And whoso breaketh a hedge, a serpent shall bite him**; namely, in accordance with the well-known and frequently confirmed fact, that serpents and other reptiles nest in old walls; comp. Isa. xxxiv. 15; Amos v. 19. The breaking of this hedge appears clearly as an action by which one seeks to injure his neighbor.—Ver. 9. **Whoso removeth stones shall be hurt therewith; and he that cleaveth wood shall be endangered thereby.** HITZIG, taking the futures יֵעָצֵב and יִסָּכֶן too much in the mere potential sense, says:

Digitized by Google

"can injure himself." See ver. 8, second clause. For הִסִּיעַ, "to break loose, to tear out," that is stones from the earth (not "to roll away," as KNOBEL says), comp. 1 Kings v. 31.—יִסָּכֶן is not equivalent to "endangereth himself" (*Sept.*, EWALD, KNOBEL and VAIHINGER), but is to be derived from שַׂכִּין a knife (from סכה "to cut;"* comp. Prov. xxiii. 2) and is to be translated in accordance with the *vulnerabitur* of the *Vulgate* by, "he will injure or wound himself," (HITZIG, ELSTER, HENGSTENBERG); see LUTHER also.—Ver. 10. **If the iron be blunt.** (ZÖCKLER translates: "If one has blunted the iron"). Since קֵהָה as piel of קָהָה "to be blunt," can scarcely mean anything else than to make blunt, we must either consider the indefinite "one," as the subject, or the wood-chopper of the previous verse. EWALD ("Authors of the O. T."), HENGSTENBERG and most ancient authors (also the Vulgate and Luther) say, that קֵהָה is to be taken intransitively, and as equivalent to *hebescit, retusum fuit*, but this is opposed by the following הוּא before לֹא־פָנִים, which clearly shows a change of subject, forbidding the thought that iron can be the subject of this clause. The view formerly entertained by EWALD, "one leaves the iron blunt" (*Poetical Books*, 1 Ed.), he afterwards discarded as incorrect.—**And he do not whet the edge.** ZÖCKLER translates: "And it is without edge." HITZIG is correct in saying that לֹא־פָנִים is formed as לֹא בָנִים "childless," 1 Chron. ii. 30, 32, and is equivalent to saying, "without an edge, or edgeless." The subsequent קִלְקַל is not to be connected with these words, but with the following ones, especially as, according to the only passage in which it occurs (Ezek. xxi. 26,) it does not signify to "polish, to sharpen," but "to shake, to swing." (HITZIG and ELSTER are correct, though in opposition to most modern writers, who translate: "And he has not whet the edge"). **Then must he put to more strength**; *i. e.*, in splitting the wood he must swing† the ax with all his strength.—**But wisdom is profitable to direct.** ZÖCKLER translates: "But it is a profit wisely to handle wisdom." Read (with HITZIG and ELSTER) הַכְשִׁיר instead of הַכְשֵׁיר thus making the infinitive construct, which, with its object חָכְמָה (as predicate to יִתְרוֹן) forms the subject (*i. e.*, it is a profit, an advantage, or, it is the best; comp. the opposite וְאֵין יִתְרוֹן in ver. 11th. For the phrase הַכְשִׁיר חָכְמָה occurring only here (lit., to make wisdom straight, *i. e.*, to direct it successfully, to handle it skillfully) comp. a similar turn הֵיטִיב חֶסֶד in Ruth iii. 10. It is usual to retain the infinitive absolute הַכְשֵׁיר as a genitive dependent on יִתְרוֹן: "And wisdom is the profit of prosperity" (KNOBEL); or, "wisdom has the advantage of amendment" (HENGSTENBERG); or, "and wisdom is the profit of exertion" (?) EWALD); or, "wisdom gives the advantage of success" (VAIHINGER). But all these renderings give a thought less clear and conformable to the text than ours. LUTHER is not exact: "Therefore wisdom follows diligence," (in harmony with the Vulgate, *et post industriam sequetur sapientia*). The rendering of HAHN is nearest to ours: "And the favor of wisdom is an advantage," wherein the sense of "favor" for הכשיר does not seem quite appropriate. The entire sense of the verse is essentially correct in the following rendering of HITZIG: Whosoever would proceed securely, and not expose himself to the dangers that are inseparable, even from the application of proper means to ends, toils in vain if he undertakes the task in the wrong way (like those fools in vers. 6–9); the direct, sensible way to the end is the best"—namely, that very humble, modest, but effective way of wisdom, which the author had recommended already in ix. 17, 18; x. 2, 3, and now in vers. 12 ff., farther recommends.

4. *Third Strophe.* Vers. 11-20.—Of the advantage of the silent, sober, and industrious demeanor of the wise man, over the indolent and loquacious nature of the fool.—**Surely the serpent will bite without enchantment.**

This sentence in close connection with verse 10 advises to a zealous and dexterous application of the remedies at the command of the wise man; but, at the same time, shows the necessity of such application by an example chosen perhaps with reference to verse 8; thus forming the transition to the warning against empty loquacity and its evil consequences contained in vers. 12-14. Koheleth does not here allude to the charming of spiritual serpents, *i. e.*, of vicious men, by importunate requests (HENGSTENBERG) but undoubtedly means the actual art of charming serpents; the possibility of which, or rather the actual existence of which he clearly presupposes in possession of wise and skillful persons, just as the author of the 58th Psalm (vers. 4 and 5), indeed, as Christ himself affirms in Mark xvi. 18; Luke x. 19. (Comp. also Ex. vii. 11, and the learned observations of Knobel on the art of charming serpents among the ancients). בְּלֹא לָחַשׁ literally, "without enchantment," *i. e.*, without that softly murmured magic formula, which, it was pretended, formed the principal agent in expelling poisonous reptiles, if spoken at the proper period, and thus guarded against the danger of being bitten. בַּעַל הַלָּשׁוֹן literally, the "master of the tongue," *i. e.*, who has the poisonous tongue of the reptile in his power, and knows how to extract the poison, or to prevent its biting; or it may also mean the "one with a gifted tongue," who by means of his tongue can produce extraordinary results (HITZIG, HAHN).

*[The meaning given to יִסָּכֶן is probably the correct one (see text note), as derived from the noun שַׂכִּין "a knife" (Arabic سكين); but שכה—סכה, means to *see*, and is only rendered to *cut* from its supposed affinity to the Latin *seco*, and to accommodate it to this word. The sense of סכן "to become poor," as in Isa. xli. 20 (pual), and in the Arabic, might perhaps answer here, but it would mar the parallelism.—T. L.]

†[See Text Note and Metrical Version.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

The latter interpretation is preferable as much on account of the analogy of בַּעַל כָּנָף Prov. i. 17, and similar expressions, as on account of the context, which clearly shows that the author has in his eye one of ready tongue not making timely use of his gift, a hero with his tongue, but without energy and promptness in action.—Ver. 12. **The words of a wise man's mouth are gracious.** Such a one therefore should not be silent, as the slack serpent-charmer in ver. 11, but should speak often and much, because he does nothing but good, and acquires favor everywhere with his "gracious" words (LUTHER). חֵן here means *id quod gratiam seu favorem parit*, or graciousness; comp. Prov. xxxi. 30; and for the sentence in general Prov. xv. 2, 26.—**But the lips of a fool will swallow up himself.** Comp. Prov. xv. 2; x. 8, 21; xiii. 16, *etc.* Any other reference of the suffix in the verb תְּבַלְּעֶנּוּ than to the logical subject כְּסִיל is inadmissible. For the plural form שִׂפְתוֹת comp. Isa. lix. 3; Ps. lix. 7.—Ver. 13. **The beginning of the words of his mouth are foolishness; and the end of his talk is mischievous madness.** That is, there is nothing discreet either in the beginning or the end of his foolish twaddle (HITZIG); he remains a fool in everything that he says; comp. Prov. xxvii. 22. "The end of his talk" is the end which his mouth makes of speaking, the last and most extravagant of his foolish speeches. Of this it is here affirmed that it is mischievous madness, namely, even for himself injurious and mischievous madness; comp. Prov. xviii. 7; Ps. lxiv. 8, *etc.*—Ver. 14. **A fool is also full of words.** To the error of his silly speech, he adds that of endless loquacity.* And he is most apt to prattle gladly and much about things of which, from their nature, he can know the least, namely, about future events. And to this fact there is again reference in what is said in the second and third clauses.—**A man cannot tell what shall be.** מַה־שֶּׁיִּהְיֶה must not be changed into מַה־שֶּׁהָיָה, according to the Septuagint, Symmachus, Vulgate, and Syriac, Vaihinger, *etc.*; for the subsequent clause does not form a tautology with the present one, even when retaining the Masoretic reading, because there is here denied in the first place only the knowledge concerning the future in itself, and then the actual existence of a foreteller of future events (as a reason for the ignorance of the future).—**And what shall be after him who can tell him?** As in אַחֲרָיו of chap. vi. 12, (but different from that in וְאַחֲרָיו of chap. ix. 3), the suffix in מֵאַחֲרָיו refers to the subject הָאָדָם, not to מַה־שֶּׁיִּהְיֶה as though there were a distinction here drawn between the near and the remote consequences of the talk of the fool (HITZIG). A restriction of the here mentioned *res futuræ* to the evil consequences of the thoughtless twaddle of the fool, is quite as

* [יַרְבֶּה דְבָרִים]. It is not mere "loquacity" that is here intended. The best explanation is that of Aben Ezra, who refers it to vain predictions, [see note on דברים, v. 5, Eng. v. 7, p. 91], or rather, boasting assertions in respect to the future: "I will eat and drink, says the fool, but he knows not what shall be in his life or in his death; as is said in another place [v. 7, vi. 12], there are many words that increase vanity, yet who knoweth what is good for man *etc.*" So also RASHI: "In his simpleness, the fool is full of words, deciding confidently and saying, 'to-morrow I will do so and so, when he knoweth not what shall be on the morrow,—or when he would undertake a journey for gain,' and knoweth not that he may fall by the sword." Comp. Luke xii. 20, James iv. 13. This is also the interpretation of MARTIN GEIER, at least in relation to the 14th verse. It is strongly confirmed by the immediately following context.

In such a rendering ו in וסכל, has an adversative force: "*Though* the fool multiply words, yet man knows not, *etc.*" "For who shall tell him what shall be *after him?*" This does not mean the remote future, nor even the future generally, as would be expressed by אחרין, but the near, the immediate, which is the sense given by the preposition in the compound מֵאַחֲרָיו, "*from after*"—that which comes from, out of or directly after the present,—or, "on the morrow," according to the language of these Jewish interpreters, and that of St. James. Comp. FUERST's derivation of מָחָר (to-morrow), which he regards, not as an independent root, but as a contraction of מֵאַחַר, as he makes it, or מֵאַחַר or מַה־אַחַר (see Marg. Note to ver. 7, p. 91).

This shows, too, the direct connection with the verse that follows, and furnishes a key to that obscure expression on which there is so much comment to so little purpose. Our English Version: "The labour of the foolish wearieth every one of them, because he knoweth not how to go to the city," is hardly intelligible in any sense that can be put upon it. The same may be said of HITZIG's and ZÖCKLER's attempts to explain it. The expression, עמל הכסילים is a collective one, "the toil of fools," equivalent to "a foolish toil," to be taken as a nominative independent, or what DE SACY styles, in his Arabic Grammar, *l'inchoatif*, or detached subject. Its separation from the verb following is shown by the change of gender,—the feminine prefix in תְּיַגְּעֶנּוּ being used to show that the immediate grammatical subject is the neuter, or indefinite, fact: "Vain toil of fools! *it* only wearieth him;" the singular objective pronoun in תְּיַגְּעֶנּוּ referring, not to כסילים taken distributively, but to the vain predicter in ver. 14, and who is kept in view throughout. "It wearieth him,"—is too much for him—surpasses his knowledge. Then אֲשֶׁר gives the reason: "One who knoweth not ללכת אל עיר, the going to the city"—so plain a fact as that—or "that he shall go to the city;" even this comes not within his knowledge of the future. "*How* to go," says our E. V., and that is the idea conveyed by most others; but there is a great difficulty in making any sense out of it, and the grammatical construction does not require it. In the small number of cases in Hebrew where we find ידע followed by the infinitive (whether with or without ל) it is to be determined by the context whether it means a knowing *how* to do a thing, or a knowledge of the doing, as a *fact* or *event*. Thus in Ecclesiastes iv. 13, it cannot mean, "knows not how to be admonished," which makes a very poor sense, but, "no longer knows (that is, heeds or recognizes) admonition," or the being admonished. In Exod. xxxvi. 1, 2 Chron. ii. 13; 1 Kings iii. 7; Isai. vii. 16; Amos iii. 10; the context favors the sense of "*knowing how.*" In Isai. xlvii. it is decidedly the other way: ידע שכול does not mean "*know how* to be bereaved," but, "know bereavement." Still more clear, and *precisely parallel to this case*, is Ecclesiastes iv. 17 (Eng. Bib. v. 1) where אינם יודעים לעשות רע can only mean the *fact:* "They know not that they are doing evil" in their sacrifices. So Ewald renders it. Hitzig and Stuart find there too the sense of *knowing how:* "They know not how to do evil," or, according to the turn they give it, "*how to be sad;*" a meaning which we do not hesitate to pronounce absurd in itself, and also altogether unsupported by 2 Sam. xii. 18, to which they refer. According to the view we have taken, the whole passage (vers. 14, 15) may be thus rendered:—

Predicting words he multiplies, yet man can never know
The thing that shall be; yea, what cometh after who shall tell?
Vain toil of fools! it wearieth him,—this man who knoweth not
What may befall his going to the city.

It is no paraphrase, but only so expressed as to give the spirit of the Hebrew as shown by the general connection, and by the evident reference of the ידע in ver. 15, to the

Digitized by Google

inadmissible as defining it to consist of his lofty plans and bold projects (HENGSTENBERG). There is simply a general mention of coming events, precisely as in the similar passage in chap. vi. 12.—Ver. 15. **The labor of the foolish wearieth every one.** Literal, "the labor of fools:" the plural is used distributively just as in verse 1; comp. Hosea iv. 8. The author here passes from the empty and annoying loquacity of the fool to his indolence, his downright inertness, and feeble slothfulness, as to qualities forming a close connection with, and mainly the foundation of, this loquacity.—**Because he knoweth not how to go to the city.** HITZIG less correctly says: "him who knoweth not," and EWALD "the one who," *etc.* But this second clause is rather intended to give the reason of the premature fatigue of the fool, as also of the feebleness and unprofitableness of his exertions. "Not to know how to go to the city," is doubtless a proverbial expression allied to that in chap. vi. 8: "to walk before the living," denoting ignorance in respect to behaviour and general incompetency. The way to the city is here mentioned as that which is the best known, most traveled, and easiest to find (VAIHINGER, HENGSTENBERG), not because it leads to those great lords described in ver. 16-19, whom it avails to bribe [EWALD], but simply in so far as the city is the seat of the rulers, of the officers, whence oppression proceeds, and whence also may come relief for the inhabitants of the land (HITZIG, ELSTER). HAHN is peculiar, but hardly in accordance with the true sense of the word אֲשֶׁר: "The travail which foolish rulers (?) prepare for their subjects makes these latter tired and faint, brings them to despair, so that they do not know regarding their going to the city, whether, or when, or how it must take place, in order not to violate a law."—Vers. 16-19 have so loose a connection with ver. 15, that HITZIG seems to be right when he perceives in them the words of the prattling fool previously described (vers. 12-15), instead of the actual speech of the author. The lament about the idle lavishing of time, and luxurious debauchery of a king and his counsellors in these verses, would be then given as an example of the extreme injudiciousness of a foolish man in his talk, and the following warning against such want of foresight (ver. 20) would then be very fittingly annexed. The whole tendency of the section would then seem directed only against thoughtless and idle loquacity, together with its evil consequences; whilst the indolence and luxury of extravagant nobles (vers. 16, 18, 19) form no object of the attack of the author, although he may consider the complaints of the foolish talker as well grounded, and may himself have lived under an authority attended with these vices.* For him who will not accept this view, for which the relation between vers. 5 and 6 of the fourth chapter may be quoted as analogous, there is no other course than, with the great majority of commentators, to see in these verses a farther exten-

---

לא ידע הארם in ver. 14. The difference between ידע לכת, and ידע ללכת, is very slight, but the ל makes it correspond more nearly to our English genitive phrase, "to know of a thing,"—that is, as an event or fact. The relative אשר here, has an inferential sense, just as ὅς, sometimes, in Greek and the Latin *qui* when equivalent to *quia*: "*who* knoweth not"—to "seeing he knoweth not," or (quod) "because he knoweth not." Such a mention of "going to the city," as one of the most common and familiar illustrations of human ignorance of the future, suggests immediately James iv. 13: "Go to ye who say to-day, or to-morrow, we will *go to a certain city, etc.*, ye who know not (οἵτινες used exactly as אשר is here) what shall be on the morrow, *etc.*" It may have been this very passage, thus understood, that suggested the illustration to the Apostle; since his language is almost identical with the very words of Rashi's interpretation. The great difficulties under which HITZIG and ZÖCKLER labor, and their far-fetched reasons, warrant the offering of the above explanation, as one that deserves attention, to say the least, in clearing up this obscure passage.

We may arrive at the same general idea, even if we render לא ידע ללכת "knows not *how to go, etc.*;" and such is substantially the conclusion of ABEN EZRA in another comment on the 15th verse: "The fool is like one who would pry into things too high or too wonderful for him, when he knows not the things that are visible and familiar, or like a man who purposes to go to a city when he knoweth not the way, and so he gets weary, and fails in his design." It is the same general lesson, the folly of confident assertions or confident plans respecting the future. Taken in either of these ways, it avoids the exceedingly forced explanations which ZÖCKLER here, and HITZIG in his commentary, give of the passage.

The expression יוֹדֵעַ לַהֲלֹךְ, vi. 8, may, perhaps, be cited as a parallel case to ידע ללכת. An answer might be found in the different form of the infinitive לכת, which is used more like a substantive denoting *the event, or fact*, as the object of knowledge. This reference, however, is at once disposed of by a consideration of the accents, which, in vi. 8, separate the two words, and require the rendering: "What to the poor man who knows,"—or "what to the *intelligent* poor man, to walk,"—or "that he should walk before the living." In other words: What profit is his intelligence in his walking before the living? Thus it becomes, according to the usual law of parallelism, an amplification of the thought just above it: "What profit to the wise?" It is another example of the spiritual and critical acuteness that dictated the Masoretic accentuation (see 2d Marginal Note, p. 94). ZÖCKLER thinks the accents here of no authority; but that great critic EWALD holds himself governed by them. The assertion, moreover, that יֹדֵעַ never has the adjective sense *intelligens*, is refuted by simply looking into a concordance, and noting the places where it is joined with the participle מֵבִין having a like adjective force. With this view agrees also Aben Ezra, the prince of Jewish critics. It is fortified, too, by the difficulty which all commentators have felt in making any clear sense out of the language: "Who *knows how* to walk before the living?" The references given by Hitzig, Gen. xvii. 1, and 2 Kings iv. 13, are not parallel; since the preposition, on which the meaning of the phrase so much depends, is entirely different.—T. L.]

*[This most absurd and far-fetched view of HITZIG only shows how a false critical theory of division may turn one of the most impressive passages of the book into a fool's gabble. It all comes from looking for logical connections where they do not exist, and from overlooking the poetical subjective character of the work as a series of meditations, each one prompting the other, but by associations discerned by the feeling rather than the ethical reason. It is the free discursive view of human folly, and of the inefficiency of man's best wisdom, that brings out the exclamation: O ill-governed land with its weak king and drunken nobles, where folly so abounds; and then this calls up the picture of the higher and purer ideal. He may have thought of the weak son to whom his kingdom was soon to be committed; it may have been a humbling thought of himself and of his own misgovernment, although there is in the way of this that Solomon's youth was the best part of his life; or it may have been prompted by his general historical experience. View it any way, it is far more expressive in this exclamatory and discursive aspect, than though it were bound together by the closest syllogistic ties. And this appears in what follows. In perfect poetical harmony does this free, contemplative style of thought turn again from the political to the common life—from the revelry and misgovernment of kings and nobles to the slothfulness, luxury, and mercenary spirit that are found in the lower plane. Yet "revile not the ruler,"—that is the next thought that arises. Obedience and reverence are still due to authority, since evils abound in all ranks. Things are described as they are, and to find here an authority for wine drinking is about as rational as to seek an excuse for sloth and shiftlessness.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

sion of the theme of indolence, business incapacity and slothfulness of fools, the treatment of which was begun in ver. 15. Ver. 16 would then pass from indolent fools in general to indolent, supine and inefficient rulers and nobles in particular. But there would then exist a very imperfect, if, indeed, any, connection with the final warning in ver. 20; indeed the open manner in which complaints are made, in what immediately precedes, regarding the bad conduct of rulers, would seem to be in direct contradiction to this warning about uttering these complaints loudly. —**Woe to thee, O land, when thy king is a child!**—That is, an inexperienced, thoughtless fool, incapable of governing; comp. 1 Kings iii. 7: Isa. iii. 4, 12,—which passages also describe it as a great misfortune to be governed by a child [νήπιος]. Therefore נַעַר is not to be rendered by "servant, slave," which latter would rather be expressed by עֶבֶד [contrary to Döderlein, Herzfeld, *et al.*).—**And thy princes eat in the morning.**—A sign of especially excessive intemperance and gluttony; see Isa. v. 11 ff.; Acts ii. 15, and compare also the classical parallels in Cicero, Phil. ii. 40; Catullus, Carm. xlvii. 5, 6; Juvenal, *Sat.* II. 49, 50.—Ver. 17. **Blessed art thou, O land, when thy king is the son of nobles.**—(בֶּן־חוֹרִים compare בַּת־נָדִיב Song of Solomon vii. 2; Isa. xxxii. 8); a noble not merely by birth, but also in disposition, *vere nobilis, generosus.*—**And thy princes eat in due season, for strength and not for drunkenness.**—Therefore make that proper use of wine treated of in Ps. civ. 15; 1 Tim. v. 23; not that perverted use against which we are warned* in Prov. xxxi. 4. בִּגְבוּרָה is not "*in* strength" (Hahn), or "in virtue" (Ewald), but "for strength," for obtaining strength. The prep. ב relates to the object on whose account the action occurs, just as in באדם ii. 24 (comp. בם iii. 12).—Ver. 18. **By much slothfulness the building decayeth.**—That is, the edifice of state, that is here compared to a house that is tottering and threatening to fall (comp. Isa. iii. 6; Amos ix. 11). The intent here is to point out the bad effects of the rioting idleness of the great ones who are called to govern a state. עֲצַלְתַּיִם literally: "the two idle" [hands]; comp. Ewald, § 180 *a*, 187 *c*. The expression is stronger than the simple form עַצְלָה or עַצְלוּת (Prov. xix. 15; xxxi. 27); "double idleness," *i. e.*, "great idleness."—**And through idleness of the hands the house droppeth through.**—That is, the rain penetrating through the leaky roof. The words שִׁפְלוּת יָדַיִם are used as elsewhere רִפְיוֹן־יָדַיִם "idleness of the hands," Isa. xlvii. 3; comp. Prov. x. 4.—Ver. 19. **A feast is made for laughter.**—A return to the description of riotous and ruinous conduct as given in verse 16. לִשְׂחוֹק "for laughter," as elsewhere בִּשְׂחוֹק with laughter; comp. for this use of לְ 2 Chron. xx. 21; Ps. cii. 5.—עֹשִׂים לֶחֶם literally, "they make bread;" *i. e.*, they give banquets, have riotous feasts. עָשָׂה לֶחֶם is therefore used here in a sense different from that in Ezek. iv. 15, where it signifies "to prepare bread, to bake bread;" comp. עָשָׂה in chap. iii. 12; vi. 12.—**And wine maketh merry.**—The suffix is wanting just as in עֹשִׂים the הֶם was left out. Comp. moreover, Ps. civ. 15, where an innocent and reasonable enjoyment of wine is meant* whilst here the allusion is to a perverted and debauching use of it, as in chap. vii. 2 ff.—**But money answereth all things.**—That is, to these luxurious rioters, who, counting on their wealth, declare in drunken arrogance that "money rules the world," "for money one can have every thing that the heart desires, wine, delicacies," *etc., etc.* For this Epicurean rule of life see Horace, *Epis.* I., 6, 36-38. עָנָה literally, "to answer, to listen to" (v. 10), but is here equivalent to "to afford, to grant;" comp. Hosea ii. 23. Hitzig unnecessarily considers יַעֲנֶה as Hiphil ("makes to hear").—Ver. 20. Concerning the probable connection with the preceding, consult vers. 16-19 above.—**Curse not the king, no, not in thy thought.**—מַדָּע elsewhere "knowledge," here "thought," Sept. συνείδησις. The signification, "study chamber," given by Hengstenberg, lacks philological authority. For the sentence comp. 2 Kings vi. 12. Hengstenberg is correct in saying: "We have here a pure rule of prudence (not a formal precept of duty), a tenet that may be simply summed up in the expression of the Lord: γίνεσθε φρόνιμοι ὡς οἱ ὄφεις."—**And curse not the rich in thy bed chamber.**—The rich here represents the noble, the prince, or the counsellor of the king (comp. v. 16).—**For a bird of the air shall carry the voice.**—That is, in an inconceivable manner, which no one would consider possible, will that be betrayed which thou hast said. See the proverb: "The walls have ears;" also Hab. ii. 11; Luke xix. 14.—**And that which hath wings shall tell the matter.**—בַּעַל הַכְּנָפַיִם equivalent to בַּעַל־כָּנָף Prov. i. 17. The K'ri would unnecessarily here strike out the article before כְּנָפַיִם.

*[As drunkenness is condemned here, or, rather, *excess of any kind*, revelling, or high banqueting, which is the predominant meaning of שְׁתִי [comp. מִשְׁתֶּה *convivium*], whilst not a word is said about any *moderate drinking*, this remark must be regarded as rather gratuitous. What makes it more than gratuitous is the fact that in Prov. xxxi. 4, instead of a mere warning against perverted use," there is enjoined upon "kings and princes" *total abstinence* from "all wine and strong drink," as something only fit to be given to persons *in extremis*, in great pain or debility [the *perishing*, the מָרֵי נֶפֶשׁ or "*bitter in soul*"], and *therefore* unfit for those in health, and especially for all who have responsible duties to perform.—T. L.]

*[In Ps. civ. 15 a *certain effect* of wine is mentioned; nothing is said about either its innocent or its immoral use. All such remarks are gratuitous.—T. L.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

(With Homiletical Hints)

Although the conclusion of the chapter—the warning against injudicious speeches assailing

Digitized by Google

the respect due to kings in ver. 20—may have been written with conscious reference to the relation of Israel to its Persian rulers, the section, taken as a whole, is simply an unambiguous illustration of the relation between wise men and fools. The allegorical conception of HENGSTENBERG, by virtue of which he sees in chap. x. 1-3 the idea that the people of God, groaning under the tyranny of the world, will be sustained by reference to the fact that the hostile world, *i. e.*, the Persian world, is given over to folly, and that thus its destruction cannot be far off,—this conception, we say, finds no sufficient support in the text; it is, rather, very decidedly opposed by the exceeding general character of the morally descriptive as well as of the admonitory parts. The contents and the tendency of the section form an eloquent, figurative, vivid and popular illustration of the superiority of wisdom over folly. The theme here treated is that favorite one of the Proverbs—the parallels between wisdom and folly [Prov. i. 20 ff.; ix. 1 ff.; x. 1 ff.; xiv. 1 ff.; xxiv. 1 ff.]; and simply with the difference that here are more emphatically and accurately described the insolence and haughtiness of fools, as well as their loquacity and indolent levity, in contrast to the corresponding virtues of the wise. See exegetical illustrations above, No. 1. *A Homily on the entire Chapter:* Of a few dominant qualities and principal characteristics of wisdom and folly.—Or, of genuine wisdom as the only remedy against the vices of pride, levity and arrogance, together with their evil consequences.—Comp. STARKE: Three moral precepts: 1. Esteem genuine wisdom (vers. 1–15). 2. Avoid indolence and debauchery (vers. 16-19). 3. Curse not the king (ver. 20).

HOMILETICAL HINTS ON SEPARATE PASSAGES.

Ch. ix. 17; x. 4. MELANCHTHON (ix. 17): The words of the wise are heard by the silent—that is, by those who are not carried away by raging lusts, but who seek for things true and salutary. (Ver. 10). Good counsels, sound teaching, well ordered methods, are constantly marred and rendered unavailing by trifling meddlers, who are more readily heard, both in courts and by the people, than the more modest and poor, who give right instruction and salutary advice. LANGE (ix. 18). He who has learned any thing thoroughly can effect much good thereby, but also much evil, if he wickedly uses what he has learned against the great purposes of God. CARTWRIGHT:—Such patient submission calms the most violent tempests of the soul; it makes tranquil the most swollen waves of passion; it turns the lion into a lamb. Let us strive then to be imbued with this virtue by which we may please God as well as men, even those who are the farthest removed from piety and humanity. STARKE (ver. 3):—It is difficult to expel folly and instil wisdom; but it becomes still more difficult when man in his folly considers himself wise (Rom. i. 22).—(Ver. 4). To suffer and patiently commend one's innocence to God is the best remedy against misused power and the wrong that we have endured, Jer. xi. 20.

GEIER (ver. 5):—Lofty positions and great power have not the privilege of infallibility. Therefore, the higher one stands, the more careful let him be, entreating God that he may not fall into error and vice.—HANSEN (vers. 6 and 7): —The want of foresight in rulers ever exerts evil influences in the world. The unworthy are thereby preferred to the worthy, and every thing takes a wrong course.—(Ver. 10):—It depends more on wisdom and foresight than on physical strength, to carry on the occupations of men with success.—HENGSTENBERG (ver. 9): He who proceeds with violence in the moral sphere, and thus performs actions that, in respect to this quality, are similar to the breaking of stone or the splitting of wood, will suffer inevitable injury.—(Ver. 10). He who in wisdom possesses the corrective whereby he can sharpen the blunt iron of his understanding, must rise, however deep he may be sunken. He who does not possess it must go to ruin, however high he may have risen.

Vers. 11-15. BRENZ:—There is nothing in man which contributes more to bring him into sin than his tongue. Truth is satisfied with the fewest and simplest words, and the wiser the man, or the more attached to truth, the more sparing is he in his speech. (Ver. 15). This teaches that no labor, no diligence, will produce fruit, if one knows not the legitimate use of labor. As the unskilled steward has much toil, with little or no result, if he knows not how to put to use the goods acquired in the proper manner, or does not carry them to market in the city.—CRAMER:—The unprofitable babblers prattle about things of no import; but the wise weigh their words with a golden balance, Sirach xxi. 27.—STARKE:—Ver. 15. That men must painfully toil is a thing of universal necessity since the fall; but to toil in profitless and sinful things is double folly and sin, Isaiah lvii. 10.—ZEYSS [ver. 15]:—Remember the city of the living God (Heb. xii. 22) and learn the right way thither, which is indeed narrow and not easy to find (Luke xiii. 24).—GEIER (ver. 16):—In judging a wise man we are not to regard his years, but the power of his mind, and what they manifest, 1 Sam. xvi. 17; 1 Tim. iv. 12.—[Ver. 17]. A pious and virtuous magistracy we should gratefully recognize as an inestimable gift of God, and heartily pray to him for their preservation.—ZEYSS (vers. 18, 19):—Beware, above all things, that the house of thy soul be not ruined by neglect, whilst thou art yielding to the flesh and its sinful desires.—TUB. BIB.:—Observe this rule of wisdom: speak no evil of thy ruler, nor of any one else, James iv. 11.—[MATTHEW HENRY] (ver. 14):—*A fool also is fond of words*, a passionate fool especially, that runs on endlessly, and never knows when to take up; it is all the same, over and over; he will have the last word, though it be but the same with that which was the first. What is wanting in the strength of his words he endeavors in vain to make up in their number. The words that follow may be taken either (1) as checking him for his vain-glorious boasting in the multitude of his words (in respect to the future), namely, what he *will do*, and what he *will have*, not considering what every body knows, that a man cannot tell *what shall be* in his own time while he lives (Prov. xxvii. 1), much less can one tell *what shall be after him*, when he is dead and gone. Or (2) as mocking him for his tauto-

Digitized by Google

logies; he is *full of words*, for if he do but speak the most trite and common thing, such as *a man cannot tell what shall be*, then, because he loves to hear himself talk, he will say it over again, *what shall be after him*, who *can tell him?* like BATTUS in *Ovid:*

Sub illis
Montibus (*inquit*) *erant, et erant sub montibus illis.*

Whence vain repetitions are called Battologies (Matth. vi. 7).—[Ver. 15. The foolish tire themselves in endless pursuits, *because they know not how to go to the city*, because they have not capacity to apprehend the plainest thing, such as the entrance to a great city. But it is the excellency of the way to the heavenly city, that it is "a highway" in which "*the wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err*" (Isaiah xxxv. 8); yet sinful folly makes men miss that way.—T. L.]

C. The only true way to happiness in this world and the world beyond consists in benevolence, fidelity to calling, a calm and contented enjoyment of life, and unfeigned fear of God from early youth to advanced age.

CHAP. XI. 1—XII. 7.

1. Of Benevolence and Fidelity to Calling.

(CHAP. XI. 1-6.)

1 Cast thy bread upon the waters, for thou shalt find it after many days.
2 Give a portion to seven, and also to eight, for thou knowest not what evil shall be
3 upon the earth. If the clouds be full of rain, they empty *themselves* upon the earth,
and if the tree fall toward the south, or toward the north, in the place where the
4 tree falleth, there it shall be. He that observeth the wind shall not sow, and he
5 that regardeth the clouds shall not reap. As thou knowest not what *is* the way of
the spirit, *nor* how the bones *do grow* in the womb of her that is with child: even
6 so thou knowest not the works of God who maketh all. In the morning sow thy
seed, and in the evening withhold not thine hand; for thou knowest not whether
shall prosper, either this or that, or whether they both *shall be* alike good.

2. Of a Calm and Contented Enjoyment of Life.

(VERS. 7-10.)

7 Truly the light *is* sweet, and a pleasant *thing it is* for the eyes to behold the sun:
8 But if a man live many years, *and* rejoice in them all; yet let him remember the days
9 of darkness, for they shall be many. All that cometh *is* vanity. Rejoice, O young
man, in thy youth; and let thy heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth, and walk
in the ways of thine heart, and in the sight of thine eyes; but know thou, that for
10 all these *things* God will bring thee into judgment. Therefore remove sorrow from
thy heart, and put away evil from thy flesh: for childhood and youth *are*
vanity.

3. Of the Duty of the Fear of God for Young and Old.

(CHAP. XII. 1-7.)

1 Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth, while the evil days
come not, nor the years draw nigh, when thou shalt say, I have no pleasure in
2 them; While the sun, or the light, or the moon, or the stars, be not darkened, nor
3 the clouds return after the rain: In the day when the keepers of the house shall
tremble, and the strong men shall bow themselves, and the grinders cease because
4 they are few, and those that look out of the windows be darkened. And the doors
shall be shut in the streets, when the sound of the grinding is low, and he shall rise
up at the voice of the bird, and all the daughters of music shall be brought low;
5 Also *when* they shall be afraid of *that which is* high, and fears *shall be* in the

Digitized by Google

way, and the almond-tree shall flourish, and the grasshopper shall be a burden, and
desire shall fail: because man goeth to his long home, and the mourners go about
6 the streets: Or ever the silver cord be loosed, or the golden bowl be broken, or the
7 pitcher be broken at the fountain, or the wheel broken at the cistern. Then shall
the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return unto God who
gave it.

[Ch. xi. Ver. 3.—יְהוּא. If it is allowable at all to vary from the text that has come down to us, this may be regarded as equivalent to שָׁם הוּא (comp. i. 5) "*there is he,*" *there it is.* It might easily arise in writing from the ear, the shewa sound being hardly perceptible. If we regard it as the future of the substantive verb הָיָה, or הוה, with א for ה, it is not a Syriasm, since the future of the Syriac verb would be יֶהֱוֵא or rather נֶהֱוֵא.—T. L.]

[Ver. 5.—כַּעֲצָמִים with ellipsis of דֶּרֶךְ, equivalent to כדרך עֲצָמִים.—T. L.]

[Xii. 3—יָזֻעוּ. This is called Aramaic, but it is as much Hebrew as it is Aramaic or Arabic. The intensive form, זעזע, occurs Hab. ii. 7. It is one of those rarer forms that are to be expected only in impassioned writing, like this of Solomon, or in any vivid description. Its frequency or rarity would be like that of the word *quake*, in English as compared with *tremble*. The rarer word [as is the case in our language] may be the older one, only becoming more frequent in later dialects according as it becomes common by losing its rarer or more impassioned significance.—T. L.]

[On the difference between יַלְדוּת and בְּחוּרוֹת xi. 9. the words שַׁחֲרוּת xi. 10, בָּטְלוּ xii. 3, יָנֵאץ xii. 5, יִרָחֵק xii. 6, and תָּרוּץ and נָרוֹץ xii. 5, see the exegetical and marginal notes.—T. L.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The close connection of verses 1-7 of the 12th chapter with chap. 11 is correctly recognized by most modern commentators; a few, as Hitzig and Elster, unnecessarily add to it also chap. xii. 8. A section thus extended beyond the limits of the 11th chapter concentrates within itself, as the closing division of the fourth and last discourse, all the fundamental thoughts of the book, and in such a manner that it almost entirely excludes the negative and skeptical elements of earlier discussions and observations [only that the words כֹּל־הֶבֶל return again in chap. xi. 8: comp. xi. 10], and therefore lets its recapitulation very clearly appear as a victory of the positive side of its religious view over the gloomy spectre of doubt, and the struggles of unbelief (comp. Int. § 1, Obs. 2). The entire section may be clearly divided into three subdivisions or strophes, the first of which teaches the correct use of life as regards actions and labor, the second concerns enjoyment, and the third the reverence and fear of God, with an admonition to these respective virtues.

2. *First Strophe, first half.* Chap. xi. 1-3. An admonition to benevolence, with reference to its influence on the happiness of him who practices it. Hitzig, instead of finding here an admonition to beneficence, sees a warning against it, an intimation that we hope too much for the good, and arm ourselves too little against future evil; but every thing is opposed to this, especially the words and sense of ver. 3, which see.—**Cast thy bread upon the waters.**—That is, not absolutely cast it away (Hitzig), nor send it away in ships (as merchandise) over the water (Hengstenberg), but "give it away in uncertainty, without hope of profit or immediate return." The admonition is in the same spirit as that in Luke xvi. 9; Prov. xi. 24 f. The Greek aphoristic poets have the expression "to sow on the water;" as Theog., *Sent.* 105. *Phocyllides*,* 142 *c.* The entire sentence (most probably as derived from this source) is found in Ben Sira (Buxtorf, *Florileg. Heb.*, page 171), and among the Arabians as a proverb: *Benefac, projice panem tuum in aquam; aliquando tibi retribuetur* (Diez, *Souvenirs of Asia*, II., 106).—**For thou shalt find it after many days.**—תִּמְצָאֶנּוּ is here clearly used in the sense of finding again.—בְּרֹב הַיָּמִים literally, "in the fullness of days, within many days." Comp. Ps. v. 6; lxxii. 7, *etc.* The sense is without doubt this: Among the many days of thy life there will certainly come a time when the seeds of thy good deeds scattered broadcast will ripen into a blessed harvest. Comp. Gal. vi. 9; 2 Cor. ix. 6–9; 1 Tim. vi. 18, 19; also Prov. xix. 17: "He that hath pity upon the poor lendeth unto the Lord."—Ver. 2. **Give a portion to seven and also to eight.**—That is, divide thy bread with *many;* for "seven and eight" are often used in this sense of undetermined plurality, as in Micah v. 4; comp. also "three and four," Prov. xxx. 15 ff.; Amos i. 3; ii. 1 ff.—Hitzig runs entirely counter to the text, and does violence to the usual signification of חֵלֶק in saying: "make seven pieces of one piece, divide it so that seven or eight pieces may spring from it," which admonition would simply be a rule of prudence (like the maxim followed by Jacob, Gen. xxxii. 8) not to load all his treasures on one ship, that he might not be *robbed* of every thing at one blow. This thought comports neither with the context nor with ver. 6, where the sense is entirely different.—**For thou knowest not what evil shall be upon the earth.**—That is, what periods of misfortune may occur when thou wilt pressingly need strength by community with others; comp. Luke xvi. 9.—Ver. 3. **If the clouds be full of rain, they empty themselves upon the earth.**—Not that evil or misfortune "occurs from stern necessity, or in immutable course" [Hitzig, and also Hengstenberg, who here sees announced the

* [The heathen sentiment of Phocyllides is as nearly the direct opposite of Solomon's as language could express, although it contains the same phrase here: μὴ κακὸν εὖ ἔρξῃς· σπείρειν ἐστιν ὡς ἐνὶ πόντῳ. "Do no favor to a bad man; you might as well sow in the sea."—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

near and irrevocable doom of the Persian monarchy], but exactly the reverse: let the good that thou doest proceed from the strongest impulse of sympathy, so that it occurs, as from a natural necessity, that rich streams of blessings flow forth from thee; comp. John vii. 38; also Prov. xxv. 14; Sirach xxxv. 24; also the Arabian proverbs in the grammar of ERPENIUS, *ed. Schultens*, p. 424. *Pluvia nubis co-operiens, dum dona funderet, etc.*—**And if the tree fall toward the south or toward the north, in the place where the tree falleth there it shall be.**—This is apparently a parallel in sense to the second clause of ver. 2, and therefore refers to the irrevocable character of the doom, or the Divine decree that overtakes man [HITZIG, HENGSTENBERG, *etc.;* also HAHN, who, however, translates the last clause thus: "One may be at the place where the tree falls," and consequently be killed by it]. But it seems more in accordance with the text, and with the introduction [not with כִּי but with the simple copula וְ] to find the same sense expressed in this second clause as in the first, and consequently thus: "the utility of the tree remains the same, whether it falls on the ground of a possessor bordering it to the north or the south; if it does not profit the one, it does the other. And it is just so with the gifts of love; their fruit is not lost, although they do not always come to light in the manner intended" (ELSTER; comp. also VAIHINGER and WOHLFARTH, *etc.*). GEIER and ROSENMUELLER are quite peculiar in the thought that the falling tree is the rich man, who is here warned of his death, after which he can do no more good deeds (similar to this are the views of SEB. SCHMIDT, STARKE, MICHAELIS, *etc.*). יְהוּא a secondary Aramaic* form of יִהְיֶה and therefore literally equivalent to: "it will *be*, it will *lie* there;" for which consult EWALD, § 192 *c*, as well as HITZIG on this passage. There is no grammatical foundation for the assertion that it is a substantive to be derived from an obsolete verb הוא and explained by the word "break" [שָׁם יְהוּא "there occurs the break or fracture of the tree," as says STARKE].

3. *First strophe, second half.* Vers. 4-6. An admonition to zealous, careful, and untiring performance in one's calling [μὴ ἐκκακεῖν, "not to faint," as before he was warned ποιεῖν τὸ καλὸν, to be earnest in well doing, Gal. vi. 9]. **He that observeth the wind shall not sow.**—A warning against timid hesitancy and its laming influence on effective and fruitful exertion. He whom the weather does not suit, and who is ever waiting for a more favorable season, misses finally the proper period for action. The second clause expresses the same admonitory thought regarding excessive considerateness.—Ver. 5. **As thou knowest not what is the way of the spirit, nor how the bones do grow in the womb of her who is with child.**—[ZÖCKLER renders "way of the wind." See the excursus appended, p. 150.—T. L.]—That is, as thou canst not comprehend nor see through the mysteries of nature. That the origin and pathway of the winds is in this regard proverbial, is shown by John iii. 8 [comp. above, chap. i. 6]. For the formation of the bones in the womb of the mother as a process peculiarly mysterious and unexplainable, comp. Ps. cxxxix. 13-18.—**Even so thou knowest not the works of God who maketh all.**—The "works" or action of God are, of course, His future dealing,* which is a mystery absolutely unknown and unfathomable by men; wherefore all success of human effort can neither be known nor calculated in advance. "Who maketh all;" for this comp. Amos iii. 6; Matth. x. 28, 29, Eph. iii. 20, *etc.*

[THE UNKNOWN WAY OF THE SPIRIT AND OF LIFE.—ECCLESIASTES xi. 5.—"As thou knowest not the way of the Spirit, nor how the bones do grow," *etc.* The words דֶּרֶךְ הָרוּחַ are rendered here by ZÖCKLER, STUART, and HITZIG, "the way of the wind." There would be good reason for this from the verse preceding; but what follows points to the sense of spirit, although the word was undoubtedly suggested by what was said in ver. 4 of the wind. The best way, however, is to regard the double idea of wind and spirit as being intended here, as in our Saviour's language, John iii. 8. About the words following there can be no mistake. The process described is set forth as the peculiar work of God, a Divine secret which human knowledge is challenged ever to discover. "Thou knowest not the way of the spirit" [רוּחִי Gen. vi. 3, "*my spirit,*" that I have given to man], "nor how the bones do grow," that is, how that spirit, or life, reorganizes itself each time, clothes itself anew in the human system, making the bones to grow according to their law, and building up for itself a new earthly house in every generic transmission. This is the grand secret, the knowledge and process of which God challenges to Himself. Science can do much, but it can never discover this. We may say it boldly, even as Koheleth makes his affirmation, science never will discover this; for it lies above the plane of the natural; and in every case, though connected with nature, demands a plus power, or some intervention, however regulated by its own laws, of the supernatural. The Bible thus presents it as God's challenged work [comp. Gen. ii. 7; vi. 3; Job xxxiii. 14; Ps. cxxxix. 13; Jerem. i. 5], the same now as in the beginning when the Word of life first went forth, and nature received a new life power, or, rather, a rising in the old. The passage of life from an old organism to a new is as much a mystery as ever. We mean the transition from the last enclosing matter of the former, through the moment of disembodiment, or material unclothing (see note, Gen., p. 170), when it takes that last matter of the previous organization, or of the seed vessel, or seed fluid, and immediately makes it the commencing food, the first material it uses in building up the new house in which it is to dwell. In respect, too, to the mystery of supernatural origin, it is as much a new creation as though that unclothed and immaterial power of life [whether in the ve-

* See the text note.

*[This is an unwarranted limitation. It refers evidently to God's dealing in nature, present and past, as well as future; and especially to the mystery of generation.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

getable or in the animal sphere] had for the first time begun its manifestation in the universe. It is the same Word, sounding on in nature, or, as the Psalmist says, "running very swiftly,"—*πνεῦμα νοερὸν, εὐκίνητον, ἐνεργετικὸν, παντοδύναμον, πάσης κινήσεως κινητικώτερον, καὶ διὰ πάντων διήκον, διὰ τὴν καθαρότητα*; Wisd. of Sol. vii. 23, 24. It is the transmission, not merely of an immaterial power (though even as a *power* science can only talk about it or find names for its phenomena), but also of a *law* and an *idea* (*νοερὸν* as well as *ἐνεργετικὸν*, an intelligent working we may say) representing, in this dimensionless monad force the new life exactly as it represented the old in all its variety, whether of form or of dynamical existence,—in other words, *transmitting* the *species*, or the specific life, as that which lives on, and lives through, and lives beyond, all the material changes that chemistry has discovered or can ever hope to discover. Science may show how this life is affected in its *manifestations* by the outward influences with which it comes in contact, the changes that may seem to enter even the generic sphere, and it may thus rightly require us to modify our outward views in respect to the number and variety of strictly fundamental forms; but the transmission itself of the species (however it may have arisen or been modified) into the same form again of specific life, or the carrying a power, a law, and an idea, in a way that neither chemical nor mechanical science can ever trace,—this is the Divine secret towards which the Darwinian philosophy has not made even an approach. Its advocates know no more about it than did the old philosophers who held a theory precisely the same in substance, though different in its technology. They talked of atoms as men now talk of fluids, forces, and nebular matter; but give them time enough, or rather give them the three infinities of time, space, and numerical quantity of conceivable forms, and they would show us how from infinite incongruities falling at last into congruity and seeming order, worlds and systems would arise, though their form, their order, and the seeming permanence arising from such seeming order, would be only names of the states that were; any other states that might have arisen being, in such case, equally entitled to the same appellations. Like the modern systems, it was all idealess, without any intervention of intelligence either in the beginning or at any stages in the process. It is astonishing how much, in the talk about the Darwinian hypothesis, these two things have been confounded,—the possible outward changes in generic forms, and the inscrutable transmission of the generic life in the present species, or in the present individual. The theory referred to is adapted only to an infinity of individual things, ever changing *outwardly*, and which, at last, fall into variety of species through an infinite number of trials and selections, or of fortunate hits after infinite failures. It makes no provision, however, for one single case of the transmission of the same specific life, either in the vegetable or the animal world. There it has to confess its ignorance, though it treats it sometimes as a very slight ignorance, soon to be removed. How pigeons, taken as an immense number of individual things, undergo an eternal series of outward changes,—how existing pigeons spread into varieties, by some being more lucky in their selections than others—all this it assumes to tell us. But in the presence of the great every day mystery, the wonderful process that is going on in the individual pigeon's egg, invisibly, yet most exactly, typing the pigeon life that now is, it stands utterly speechless. One of its advocates seems to regard this as a very small matter, at present, indeed, not fully understood as it will be, but of little consequence in its bearing on the great scheme. It has its laws undoubtedly, but the *principle of life*, he maintains, is chemical,—that is, it is a certain *arrangement* of matter. Now this we cannot *conceive*, much less *know*. We are equally baffled whether we take into view the grosser (as they appear to the sense) or the more ethereal kinds of matter, whether as arranged in greater magnitudes, or in the most microscopic disposition of atoms, molecules, or elementary gases constituted by them. We may attempt still farther to etherealize by talking of forces, motions [motions of what?] heat, magnetism, electricity, *etc.* They are still but *quantities*, matters of more or less. And so the modern chief of the positive school has boldly said: all is quantity, all is number; life is quantity, thought is quantity (so much motion); what we call virtue is quantity; it can be measured. And so all knowledge is ultimately mathematics, or the science of quantity. There is nothing that cannot be reduced, in its last stages, to a numerical estimate. There is, moreover, just so much matter, force, and motion in the universe,—ever has been, ever will be. And there is nothing else. But how life, a thing in itself dimensionless, to say nothing of feeling, thought, and consciousness, can come out of such estimates is no more conceivable of one kind of matter, however moving, than it is of another. Still more do we fail to imagine how it can, in any way, be the result of figure, arrangement, position, quantity, or of *σχῆμα, τάξις, θέσις*, as LEUCIPPUS and DEMOCRITUS called their three prime originating causalities [see ARISTOT., Met. II. 4]. But so it is, they still continue to insist, though chemistry has searched long and could never find it, or even "the way to its house," as is said, Job xxxvii. 20, of the light. Prof. HAECKEL, of Jena, in his *Natürliche Schöpfungsgeschichte*, maintains "that all organized beings are potentially present in the first matter of the nebular system." He looks upon "all the phenomena of life as a natural sequence of their chemical combination, as much as if they were conditions of existence, *though the ultimate causes are hidden from us*." There may be some truth in what is said about *conditions* [for conditions are not causes], but it is the other remark that demands attention: "*though* the ultimate causes may be hidden from us." He seems to regard this as a very slight circumstance, which ought to have little effect on the great argument of what calls itself the exact and "positive philosophy." There is yet indeed an unimportant break in the chain; a link or two is to be supplied; that is all, they would say. But what data have we for determining what is lacking before the full circuit of knowledge is completed? A most important inquiry this: how great is the separation made by the unknown?

Digitized by Google

Is it a few inches, or a space greater than the tellar distances? Is it a thin partition through hich the light is already gleaming, or is it a vast m, compared with which any difference be- the most ancient and the most modern dge is as nothing? Is it something that assed over in time, or is it the measure- of infinity which the Eternal and Infi- lone can span? "They are yet hid- ' he says. Is there the least ray of st advanced science that shows us approaching this mysterious re- Is there any reason to think ticle more about it than ARIS- ancient positivists who talked nd θέσις, or any of those profound old whose better reasoned atheism has so fully refuted in his great And yet this professor of "exact sci- talks of his *monera*, the prototypes of the *otista*, and how from these came *neutral monera*, and from these, again, vegetable and animal monera, just as freely as though he knew all about it from his inch of space and moment of time, or had not just admitted an ignorance which puts him at an inconceivable distance from that which he so confidently claims to explain. For it should be borne in mind that science has not merely failed to discover the principle of life, as "positive knowledge;" she cannot even *conceive* it: she cannot form a theory of it which does not run immediately into the old mechanical and chemical language of number and quantity, out of which she cannot think, nor talk, without bringing in the supernatural, and that, too, as something above her province. After what is told us about the *monera, etc.*, the writer proceeds to say: "*this once established*, from each of the archetypes, we have a genealogy developed which gives us the history of the protozoan and animal kingdoms," *etc.*, as though any thing had been established, and he had not admitted his ignorance of a prime truth without which he cannot take a step in the direction in which he so blindly hastes. There is nothing new in this, in substance, though there may be much that is novel in form and technology. It is the old philosophy of darkness. It is as true of this modern school as it was of the old cosmologists of whom ARISTOTLE first said it, ἐκ νύκτὸς πάντα γεννᾶν, "that they generate all things out of Night." This bringing every thing out of the nebular chaos through mechanical action and chemical affinities, and these grounded on nothing else than σχῆμα, τάξις, and θέσις, is nothing more than the Hesiodean generations, or the Love and Discord, the attractions and repulsions, of EMPEDOCLES. It is the pantogony of these old world builders, but without their splendid poetry.

"All organized beings in the first nebular matter," and that from eternity! Then, of course, there has been no addition in time, no plus quantity, or plus power, or any plus idea combined with power; for that would be something which previously was not. NEWTON was in the toad-stool; for what is not *in* cannot come *out*, or be developed; and so every toad-stool now contains a NEWTON; every fungus contains an academy of science, or a school of "positive philosophy." The carbon, hydrogen, nitrogen, oxygen, or still earlier and more formless matter out of which this thinking arises, is there, only in a different τάξις and θέσις, perhaps. There has been no more addition to nature in the physical development of the rationalist commentator than in that of the כִּנִּם (Exod. viii. 17; Ps. cv. 31) or Egyptian lice, whose *immediate* production he regards as beneath the dignity of any supposed Divine or supernatural action. And so there can be no *real* or *essential* difference in rank. The *kinnim* were as much in the first matter as the phosphorus that thinks in the brain of the theologian; they had as high and as old a place. The *idea*, too, of the *kinnim* was there, and all the machinery of their development; so that there was no saving of means or labor; their *immediate* genesis would cost no more, or be any more of a belittling work, than their mediate, or developed production. These insignificant creatures were *provided* for from all eternity. But *providing* means *foreseeing, foreknowing;* and language revolts. We cannot consistently talk atheism or materialism in any human dialect; God be thanked for such a *provision* in the origin and growth of speech. We can, indeed, say in words, as one of the boldest of this godless school has said, *ohne Phosphor kein Gedanke*, "without phosphorus no thought;" but then we must give up the word *idea* as, in any sense a cause originating; for there could be no idea antecedent to the phosphoric matter, or that *order* and *position* of it, out of which *idea*, or the development of thought, was to arise; that is, any idea of phosphorus before phosphorus. There is, then, nothing eternal, immutable, undeveloped, or having its being in itself, and to which, as an ideal standard, the terms *higher* and *lower* can be referred to give them any meaning. For all *risings* of matter, or form, to higher forms regarded as any thing else than simply unfoldings of previous matter, or previous arrangements of forces, are *creations* as much as any thing that is supposed first to commence its being as a whole; since *more from less* involves the maxim *de nihilo*, as well as *something* from *nothing* in its totality. If they were in that previous matter without a new commandment, a new *word*, and a plus activity accompanying it, then they are not truly a rising. They are no more, in *quantity*, than what they were; and quantity is all. Quality, according to COMTE, is but a seeming; it is not a positive entity, but only σχῆμα, τάξις, and θέσις, an arrangement of matter. The *potentiality*, then, has all that there is, or can be, in any actuality. Even that inconceivable power which causes any potentiality to be thus potential, is, itself, only a potentiality included in the infinite sum of potentiality, which, as a whole, is also, in *some way*, caused to be what it is, and as it is. We say, *in some way;* for to say for *some reason*, would, at once, be bringing in a new word, and a new idea, utterly foreign to this whole inconceivable scheme. According to the other philosophy, Reason is "*in the beginning*," ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος (John i.; Prov. viii. 22). But here reason is junior to matter, something developed, and which could, therefore, neither as *intelligens* nor as *intellectum*, be made a ground of that from which itself proceeds. We can never get out of this labyrinth; for the moment we bring in a plus

Digitized by Google

quantity, or a plus activity, or a plus idea, or any thing seeming to be such, we only have a new causative potentiality, and that demanding another, which is potential of it, and so on *ad infinitum;* the infinity, too, not proceeding from the highest downward, but from the lowest state [or that which is next to nothing], as being the *first* possible manifestation of being in the universe of conceivable things. Again, it may be asked, why has not this infinite potentiality, in this infinite time, developed all things potential, so that pigeons should long since have become arch-angels, and our poor, earthly, dying race long since risen "to be as gods." Or how, if we shrink from that, are we to avoid the converse conclusion, that the whole state of things now actual, now developed, is still infinitely *low*, and that the *highest* and *best* in the sphere of soul, and thought, and reason, is not only as yet undeveloped, but infinitely far in condition, and eternally far in time, from its true actuality,—if, in such a scheme, *highest* and *best* have any real meaning. It makes the lowest and most imperfect first, the best and perfect last, or at such an infinite distance that it may be said they never come. Religion and the Scriptures just reverse this. They put soul first, mind first, the Personal first, the all Holy, the all Wise, the all Righteous, the all Perfect, first, whilst every seeming imperfection contributes to the manifestation of the infinite excellency and infinite glory of the one separate personal God who is first of all and over all.

How poor the science of Koheleth, it may be said, and yet he has propounded here a problem having regard to one of the most common events of life, but which the ages are challenged to solve: "As thou knowest not the way of the spirit, or even how the bones do grow in the womb of her that is with child, even so thou knowest not the work of God who worketh all,"—אֶת־הַכֹּל *the all*, the great paradigm which He is bringing out in space and time [ch. iii. 14], and for those moral and spiritual ends to which the natural, with all its changes, and all its developments, is at every moment subservient In one sense, indeed, it has no plus quantities. All is provided for in Him "who is the A and the Ω, the First and the Last, the ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος, the Beginning and the End." "All that God doeth is for the olam, the Great Eternity" [iii. 14]. "Nothing can be added to it or taken from it;" but this, instead of excluding the supernatural, or shutting all things up in nature, necessitates the idea that there is a world above nature, a power, or rather an Eternal "Word [ἐν ᾧ τὰ πάντα συνέστηκε (Col. i. 17)] in whom all things *consist*," or stand together. This Word still speaks in nature. There, still abides its constant voice, קוֹל דְּמָמָה דַקָּה [1 Kings xix. 12], *susurrus auræ tenuis*, its "thin still voice," that is heard "after the fire and the wind," its שֵׁמֶץ דָּבָר, its "whisper word," as Job calls it, xxvi. 14; and then again there is the "going forth" of its "mighty thunder voice," רַעַם גְּבוּרֹתָיו which "none but God can understand," speaking in its great periodic or creative utterances, as it did of old, and as it shall speak again, when it calls for the "new heavens and the new earth," giving to nature its new movement and its still holier Sabbath. It is this greater utterance that brings into the natural development its plus powers and plus ideas, not from any undeveloped physical necessity, but from a Divine fullness, not arbitrarily, but from its own everlasting higher law.

Throughout all the seeming nature there remains this mysterious, generative, life-giving process in the vegetable, the animal, and especially in the human birth, as a constant symbol of the supernatural presence, or of the old unspent creative force, still having its witness in continually recurring acts, ever testifying to the great Divine secret that baffles science, and to the explanation of which she cannot even make an approach.

There is an allusion to this mystery of generation, Ps. cxxxix. 13: "Thou didst *possess* my reins [claim them as thine own curious work], thou didst overshadow me in my mother's womb." So also in ver. 15: "My substance was not *hid from thee*,"—עָצְמִי *my bone*, the same symbolic word that is here employed by Koheleth. In fact, it was ever so regarded by the earliest mind, as it must be by the latest and most scientific. Koheleth simply expressed the proverbial mystery of his day. It existed in the thinking and language of the most ancient Arabians; as is evident from the use Mohammed makes of it in the Koran. His mode of speaking of it shows that it was a very old query that had long occupied the thoughts of men. Hence his adversaries are represented as proposing it to him as a test of his being a true prophet (see *Koran* Sur. XVII. 78): "They will ask thee about *the spirit* (عن الروح); say: the *spirit* is according to the command of my Lord, and ye have been gifted with knowledge but a very *little way*." When he says "the spirit is by the *command* of my Lord," he has reference to a distinction that was made (and very anciently it would seem) between the creation of spirit, and that of matter, or nature strictly. The latter was through media, steps, or growth, whilst spirit was *immediate*, by the *command* of God, according to the language of Ps. xxxiii. 9, or the frequent expression in the Koran which so closely resembles it, كُنْ فكان, "be, and it was." AL ZAMAKHSHARI, in his Commentary, p. 783, 2, tells us that the Jews bid the Koreish ask Mohammed three questions—one about the mystery of "the cave and the sleepers," one about Dhu l' Karnein, and the third, this question about the spirit. If he pretended to answer them all, or if he answered neither of them, then he was no true prophet. He answered the first two, but confessed his ignorance of the human soul, as being something "the knowledge of which God had reserved to Himself." Then he told them that there was the same reserve in their law (the Old Testament) which revealed to them nothing about the way of the spirit, דרך הרוח. If Mohammed knew any thing about the Bible (and there is but little reason in the contrary supposition), then it may be

Digitized by Google

reasonably thought that in what is thus said of him by the Koranic commentator, he had reference to such passages as this of Ecclesiastes (compare also Eccles. iii. 21, מִי יֹדֵעַ רוּחַ, "who knoweth the spirit," *etc.*), or to the general reserve of the Old Testament respecting the soul, or in a more special manner to Gen. ii. 7; vi. 3, where there are ascribed to God the more direct creation of, and a continued property in, the human spirit. This would seem, too, from Ps. civ. 29, to be asserted, in some sense, even of the animal creation.—T. L.]

Ver. 6. **In the morning sow thy seed.**—The sowing of seed is here a figurative designation of every regular vocation or occupation, not specially of benevolence; comp. Job iv. 8; Ps. cxxvi. 5; 1 Cor. ix. 10, 11.—**And in the evening withhold not thine hand.**—Literal, "towards evening" (לָעֶרֶב), *i. e.*, be diligent in thy business from the early morning till the late evening, be incessantly active.—**For thou knowest not whether shall prosper, either this or that.**—אֵי זֶה, not "what," but "whether;" the expression refers, as it seems, to the double labor, that of the morning and that of the evening. "We are to arrange labor with labor, because the chances are equal, and we may therefore hope that if one fails, the other may succeed. God may possibly destroy one work—and who knows which? (comp. chap. v. 6); it is well if thou then hast a support, a second arrow to send" (HITZIG).—**Or whether they shall both be alike good**—*i. e.*, whether both kinds of labor produce what is really good, substantial and enduring, or whether the fruit of the one does not soon decay, so that only the result of the other remains. כְּאֶחָד "together," as in Ezra vi. 20; 2 Chron. v. 13; Isa. lxv. 25.

4. *Second strophe.* Vers. 7-10. Admonition to calmness and content, ever mindful of divine judgment, and consequently to the cheerful enjoyment of the blessings of this life.—**Truly the light is sweet, and a pleasant thing it is for the eyes to behold the sun.** HITZIG correctly gives the connection with the preceding: The tendency of the advice in vers. 1-6 (mainly in ver. 6) to secure guaranties in life, is justified in ver. 7. "Life is beautiful and worthy of receiving care." ELSTER is less clear and concise: "Such an energy of mental activity (as that demanded in vers. 1-6) will only be found where there is no anxious calculation about the result; but where man finds alone in the increased activity of his mental powers, (?) and in the intense striving after an eternal goal, his satisfaction and reward," *etc.* The "light" here stands for life, of which it is the symbol. (Comp. Ps. xxxvi. 9; xlix. 19; lvi. 13; Job iii. 20). And so the expression: "to behold the sun," for which see not only Ps. lviii. 9; John xi. 9, but also passages in classic authors, *e. g.*, EURIPIDES, IPHIG. in *Aul.* 1218: *ἡδὺ γὰρ τὸ φῶς βλέπειν*; also HIPPOL. 4: *φῶς ὁρῶντες ἡλίου*; PHOENISS: *εἰ λεύσσει φάος*.—Ver. 8. **But if a man live many years.** כִּי here greatly increases the intensity of thought (comp. Job vi. 21; Hosea x. 5); it is consequently to have no closer connection with the following אִם; comp. Prov. ii. 8; Isa. x. 22, *etc.*—**And rejoice in them all**; [ZÖCKLER renders: Let him rejoice in them all];* therefore daily and constantly rejoice, in harmony with the apostolic injunction, *χαίρετε πάντοτε.* See the "Doctrinal and Ethical" to know how this sentence is to be reconciled, in Koheleth's sense, with the truth that all is vanity, and at the same time to be defended against the charge of Epicurean levity. —**Yet let him remember the days of darkness, for they shall be many.** כִּי is here the relative, not the causal *ὅτι*; comp. the *Septuagint: καὶ μνησθήσεται τὰς ἡμέρας τοῦ σκότους, ὅτι πολλαὶ ἔσονται.* "The days of darkness are those to be passed after this life in Scheol, the dark prison beneath the earth (chap. ix. 10), the days when we shall no longer see the pleasant light of the sun, or the period of death;" comp. Job x. 21, f.; xiv. 22; Ps. lxxxviii. 12, *etc.*—**All that cometh is vanity**; that is, that cometh in this world; everything that exists in this life, consequently all men especially; comp. chap. vi. 4; John i. 9. Nevertheless the translation should not be in the masculine; the *Septuagint* is correct: *πᾶν τὸ ἐρχόμενον, ματαιότης.* The sense given by VAIHINGER and ELSTER is too broad: "All future things are vanity." But even this is more correct than the *Vulgate* and LUTHER, who refer שֶׁבָּא to the past. Moreover the clause is a confirmation of what precedes, though used without a connective, and therefore making a still greater impression.—Ver. 9. **Rejoice, O young man in thy youth.**—Here we again have a vividly emphatic omission of the connective. That which the previous verse recommended in general, is now specially addressed to youth as that period of life especially favorable to cheerful enjoyment, and therefore, in accordance with God's will, especially appointed thereto. But the necessary check is indeed immediately placed upon this rejoicing, by the reminder of the duty to forget not that God will bring to judgment. בְּ in בְּיַלְדוּתֶךָ does not give the cause or object of rejoicing, but, as also in בִּימֵי in the following clause (comp. Isa. ix. 2), the period and circumstances in which it is to occur.—**And let thy heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth.**† For this expression comp. i. 17;

*[XI. 8. בְּכֻלָּם יִשְׂמָח. To take this as an exhortation: "Let him rejoice," *etc.*, would not seem very congruous to what follows: "let him remember the days of darkness," which is certainly not a joyful thought. Our English translators have inserted the conjunction: "*and* in them all rejoice," which gives the spirit of the passage, although there is no ו in the Hebrew. The better way is to regard the particles כִּי and אִם as affecting both the futures, the second as well as the first, whilst the third, introduced by the conjunction, is the one exhortation of the sentence, to which the others are preparatory: "For *if* a man shall live many years, *if* he shall rejoice in them all," or as it is elliptically, yet most literally, expressed in the Metrical Version—

Yet if a man live many years, in all of them rejoice,
The days of darkness let him not forget.

Or it may be the imperative style with the conditional aspect: let him live, let him rejoice, (that is, though he live, though he rejoice) yet let him remember, *etc.* In such a rendering there is no discord in the thought.—T. L.]

†[Ver. 9. בְּחוּרוֹתֶךָ, a rising upon the word יַלְדוּת childhood, as is seen by the parallelism. It is the period of

Digitized by Google

iii. 18; vii. 25, *etc.* The heart delights the whole man in proportion as it itself is טוֹב, that is, of good cheer.—**And walk in the ways of thine heart,** *i. e.*, in the ways in which it will go; follow it. Comp. Isa. lvii. 17 and for the thought above chap. ii. 10.—**And in the sight of thine eyes,** *i. e.*, so that thy observation of things shall form the rule for thy conduct, (comp. iii. 2–8). This is in accordance with the k'ri בְּמַרְאֵה, which is attested by all versions and manuscripts; the ketib בְּמַרְאֵי which is preferred by HENGSTENBERG and others, would designate the multitude of the objects of sight as the rule for walking, which, as HITZIG correctly observes, would be an intolerable zeugma. We moreover decidedly condemn the addition of לֹא before בְּמַרְאֵה: "and *not* according to the sight of thine eyes," as is found in the Codex Vaticanus of the *Septuagint*, and in the Jewish Haggada; for the passage in Numb. xv. 39, that probably furnished the inducement to this interpolation, is not, when rightly comprehended, in antagonism with the present admonition; for quite as certain* as the allusion is there to amorous looks of lust, is it here, on the contrary, to an entirely innocent use of sight, and one well-pleasing to God.—**But know thou, that for all these things God will bring thee to judgment.** Comp. Job xi. 6. The judgment (מִשְׁפָּט) is very certainly not merely to be considered as one of this world, consisting of the pains of advanced age (HITZIG), described in chap. xii. 1, ff., or of human destinies as periods of the revelation of divine retributive justice in general (CLERICUS, WINZER, KNOBEL, ELSTER, *etc.*). The author rather has in view the "judgment" in the absolute sense, the great reckoning after death, the last judgment, as the parallels Ps. cxliii. 2; Job xiv. 3; xix. 29, *etc.*,† incontestably show (comp. also Heb. ix. 27; x. 27); the preludes of the final judgment belonging to this life come into view only as subordinate. Neither ver. 8 of this chapter, nor chap. ix. 10 are opposed to this; for Koheleth in these teaches not an eternal, but only a long sojourn in Scheol. Our interpretation receives also the fullest confirmation in chap. iii. 17 as in chap. xii. 7, 14.—Ver. 10. **Therefore remove sorrow from thy heart.** The positive command to rejoice, is here followed by the warning against the opposite of rejoicing כַּעַס "sorrow, dissatisfaction;" the *Septuagint*, *Vulgate*, GEIER, *etc.*, most unfittingly render it "anger," just as the following, רָעָה which means "evil, misfortune," they render, "wickedness," (*πονηρία*, *malitia*). The recommendation to cheerfulness instead of sadness and melancholy (comp. Mal. iii. 14; Isa. lviii. 3) is here clearly continued; comp. chap. ix. 7, ff. For בָּשָׂר in the second clause, comp. chap. v. 6.—**For childhood and youth are vanity.** The figure (הַשַּׁחֲרוּת a later expression for שַׁחַר; comp. the *Talmudic* שַׁחֲרִית), and the thing compared (הַיַּלְדוּת also a later word) are here, as in chap. v. 2; vii. 1, connected by a simple copula. Koheleth would have written more clearly, but less poetically and effectively if he had said "for as the dawn of the morning so is the period of youth all vanity" (*i. e.*, transitory, fleeting, comp. vii. 6; ix. 9).

[KOHELETH'S DESCRIPTION OF OLD AGE, chap. xii.—The imagery and diction of this remarkable passage show it to be poetry of the highest order; but it presents a very gloomy picture. Even as a description of the ordinary state of advanced life, it is too dark. It has no relief, none of those cheering features, few though they may be, which Cicero presents in his charming treatise *De Senectute.* As a representation of the old age of the godly man, it is altogether unfitting. Compare it with the שֵׂיבָה טוֹבָה, the "good old age" of Abraham and David, Gen. xv. 15, 1 Chron. xxix. 28, the serene old age of Isaac, the honored old age of Jacob, the hale old age of Moses and Joshua. See how Isaiah (xl. 30, 31) describes the aged who wait upon the Lord: "The youths may faint and be weary, even the young men may utterly fail, but they who wait on Jehovah shall renew their strength, they shall mount up on wings as eagles, they shall run and not be weary, they shall walk and not faint." A more direct contrast is furnished by the striking picture of aged saints, Ps. xcii. 15: They are like the grandæval cedars of Lebanon; "planted in the house of the Lord, they shall still bring forth fruit in old age; they shall be fat and flourishing" (more correctly, "still resinous and green"), *be evergreens;* or, as WATTS has most beautifully paraphrased it,

> The plants of grace shall ever live;
> Nature decays, but grace must thrive;

---

commencing manhood. Its etymological sense would be the *choice period* of life, from בחר primary sense, that of *exploring, proving* (the keen eye), hence choosing, selecting that which is most precious. From this the idea of excellence, superiority. In the noun בָּחוּר, it is taken collectively for the youth, the choice young men, as in Isaiah xl. 29, where, in the parallelism it is a rising on נְעָרִים, "the youths shall be weary, even the young men shall utterly fall." Here it is an abstract noun in the fem. plural, to denote intensity. We have the masculine plural in the same way, Numb. xi. 28. It is of the same form, in the masculine, with זְקֻנִים an intensive form to denote extreme feebleness of age. This is the direct opposite.—T. L.]

*[How is it "certain," unless it be that the hard necessities of this exegesis demand such an assertion? The two expressions are precisely alike, both in their letter and their spirit. There is nothing said, Numb. xv. 39, about "amorous looks," since the word זְנוּת applies to any evil desire, any going away after the eye (see Ps. lxxiii. 27), and is often used of idolatry. The term מַרְאֶה, which is so much used of female beauty, suggests the idea here, more than any thing in the other passage. Everywhere else this kind of language, "following the heart," the "desires of the heart," "going after the eye," *the sense* (compare Job xxxi. 7), is used in *malam partem*, and to give it just the contrary sense here, as something "well pleasing to God," is to abandon every safe guide in interpretation. See the remarks on the solemn and sorrowful irony of this passage, in connection with ix. 7–9: Note on the Alleged Epicureanism of Koheleth; p. 132.—T. L.]

†[Still more striking allusions to such a judgment may be found Ps. i. 5; Job xxi. 30, the יוֹם אֵיד, the יוֹם עֲבָרוֹת, the *dies iræ* (*irarum*) "to which the wicked are reserved;" as also to Psalm xlix. 15, "the morning (לַבֹּקֶר) in which the just shall triumph."—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

Time that doth all things else impair,
Still makes them flourish, strong and fair.
Laden with fruits of age they show,
The Lord is holy, just and true;
None that attend His gates shall find,
A God unfaithful or unkind.

Another very striking contrast to this is that picture which Solomon twice gives us in the Proverbs xvi. 31, and xx. 29, "the hoary head a crown of glory when found in the way of righteousness." But one supposition remains; the picture here given is the old age of the sensualist. This appears, too, from the connection. It is the "evil time," the "day of darkness" that has come upon the youth who was warned in the language above, made so much more impressive by its tone of forecasting irony. It is the dreary old age of the young man who *would* "go on in every way of his heart, and after every sight of his eyes,"—who did not "keep remorse from his soul, nor evils from his flesh"—and now all these things are come upon him, with no such alleviations as often accompany the decline of life. Such also might be the inference from the words with which the verse begins: "Remember thy Creator *while* the evil days come not" (עד אשר לא). It expresses this and more. There is a negative prohibitory force in the עד אשר: So remember Him that the evil days come not,—"*before they come*," implying a warning that such coming will be a consequence of the neglect. Piety in youth will prevent such a realizing of this sad picture; it will not keep off old age, but it will make it cheerful and tolerable, instead of the utter ruin that is here depicted.

Another argument is drawn from the character of the imagery. The general representation is that of the decay of a *house*, or rather of a household establishment, as a picture of man going to his eternal *house*, his בית עולם, *ἀΐδιον οἰκητιν*. This earthly house (*ἐπίγειος οἰκία*, 2 Cor. v. 1) is going to ruin, but the style of the habitation is so pictured as to give us some idea of the character of the inhabitant. It is not the cottage of the poor, nor the plain mansion of the virtuous contented. It is the house of the rich man (Luke xvi. 19) who has "fared sumptuously (*λαμπρῶς*, splendidly) every day." The outward figure is that of a lordly mansion,—a palace or castle with its "keepers," its soldiers, or "men of might," its purveyors of meal and provisions, its watchers on the turrets. It is a luxurious mansion with its gates once standing wide open to admit the revellers, now closing to the street. The images that denote these different parts of the body, the different senses or gates of entrance to the soul, are all so chosen as to indicate the kind of man represented. It is the eye that looked out for every form of beauty, the mouth (the teeth) that demanded supplies of the most abundant and delicious food. It is the ear that sought for "singing women," כָּל בְּנוֹת הַשִּׁיר, the loudest and most famed of the "daughters of song." And so, too, the appurtenances at the close of the description, the hanging lamps, the golden bowl, the costly fountain machinery all falling into ruin, present the same indications of character, and of the person represented.

Another very special mark of this may be traced in the expression וְתָפֵר הָאֲבִיּוֹנָה ver. 5, rendered, "desire shall fail," rather, "shall be frustrated," still raging but impotent. How characteristic of the old sensualist, and yet how different from the reality in the virtuous old age that has followed a temperate and virtuous youth! See how Cicero speaks of such failure of desire as a release, a relief, instead of a torment: *libenter vero istinc, tanquam a domino furioso, profugi; De Senectute*, 47. This view is rendered still stronger, if we follow those commentators who would regard אביונה as denoting an herb used for the excitement of failing desire: It shall fail to have its effect. The meaning seems plain, however, as commonly taken, and there is, perhaps, no good reason for departing from the etymological sense. Everything goes to show that Watts has rightly paraphrased the passage—

Behold the aged *sinner* goes,
Laden with guilt and heavy woes,
Down to the regions of the dead.

The soul returns murmuringly to God, as though with its complaint of the cruel and degrading treatment it had received from "the fleshly nature" "in the earthly house," or as a wailing ghost "driven away" (see Prov. xiv. 32), naked and shivering into the uncongenial spiritual sphere.

It is in view of such a life, and such a death, that we see the force of the closing exclamation—"O vanity of vanities—all vanity!" As a finale to the life and death of the righteous, even if the writer, like Solon, had had reference only to this world, it would have seemed inharmonious and out of place. If we regard it, however, as Solomon's picture of himself repenting *in extremis*, then may we indulge a more cheerful hope in regard to its close, though still with the wail of vanity as its mournful accompaniment. One thing seems almost certain. Such a description as this, so sad, so full of feeling, must have been written by one who had had some experience of the situation described. There is a pathos about it that indicates personality, and a personal repentance. If so, no one is so readily suggested as the king of Israel, whose fall into sensuality and idolatry is so vividly described, 1 Kings xi., where the divine judgments upon him are also fully set forth. His repentance is not there mentioned, but it may be because this book of Koheleth, which he left behind him as his brief spiritual autobiography, contained such ample evidence of the fact.—T. L.]

5. *Third strophe.* Chap. xii. 1-7. An admonition to fear God during youth, and not to leave this till old age, the period when approaching death announces itself through many terrors—here depicted in a series of poetical figures drawn from the various realms of nature and human life.—**Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth.** For the plural בּוֹרְאֶיךָ see chap. v. 8 preceding. The word "remember" (זכר) is, of course, a remembering with becoming reverence, as well as with a feeling of gratitude for the many blessings received. It is therefore substantially the same with the *fear* expressly recommended in chap. xii. 18, and in substance, at least, in chap. xi. 9, second

Digitized by Google

clause.—**While the evil days come not.** Literally, "until not," *i. e.*, "before;" just as in ver. 2 and in the later recapitulation ver. 6. The "evil *days*," and the "*years*" following are naturally the years of old age, of the period immediately preceding death, in contradistinction to the joyous period of youth.—Ver. 2. **While the sun, or the light,* or the moon or the stars be not darkened.** The darkening of the sun and the light must here be synonymous with the diminishing and the saddening of the joys of life, as is experienced in advanced age. A more special interpretation of the sun and the light, as well as of the moon and the stars (only added to finish the description), is inadmissible, and leads to platitudes, as is the case with Glassius, Oeting, and F. W. Meyer, who think of the darkening powers of the mind or with Wedel, who would interpret the sun by the heart, the moon by the brain, the stars by the bowels (!), and the clouds and rain, even, by the catarrhal rheums of old age (!). Moreover the darkening of sun, moon and stars is a favorite figure for seasons of misfortune, punishment and judgment; comp. Joshua iii. 4; ii. 10; Amos viii. 9; Isa. xiii. 10; Ezek. xxxii. 7; Acts ii. 20; Rev. vi. 12. The same is also found in classic authors, *e. g.*, Catullus viii. 3; *Fulsere quondam candidi tibi soles;* Martial Epigr. v. 20, 11: *Bonosque soles effugere atque abire sentit.*—**Nor the clouds return after the rain.** That is, one calamity follows another, one season of misfortune begins where the other ceases. The rainy season, or winter, is therewith described, in contrast to the mere showers or passing thunder storms of summer. Old age is symbolized as the winter† (or autumn of life, as it has previously been termed the approaching night; comp. Job xxix. 3; where the mature age of man is designated as "the days of autumn" (יְמֵי חָרְפִּי). So we too sometimes speak of the evening, the autumn, and the winter of life.—Vers. 3-5. A more intimate figurative description of old age's infirmity and proximity to death. This is here represented under the figure of a house whose inhabitants, formerly cheerful and animated, now become weak, inactive and sad. Umbreit and Elster condemn this view as harsh and devoid of taste, and consider the passage rather as a poetic description of the day of death, which is represented under the figure of a fearful tempest, see especially Gurlitt, *Studien und Kritiken*, 1865, II., p. 331, ff. (comp. p. 27, preceding). Comp. also the subsequent remarks under the head of Doctrinal and Ethical.—**In the day when the keepers of the house shall tremble.** The human body is often compared to a house* or a tent, *e. g.*, Isa. xxxviii. 12; Wisdom ix. 15; Job iv. 19; 2 Cor. v. 1, ff.; 2 Peter i. 13, f. So also in profane writings, *e. g.*, in the Arabian poet Hariri, (Rueckert's Ed., p. 293); in Virgil, Eneid VI., 734. The "keepers of the house" are the arms with the hands, that are intended to protect the body, but which become tremulous in aged persons. These are considered as outside of the house, but as closely belonging to it. For the use of the hands as protection and armor for the body, comp. Galen, *de usu partium* I., (4 Opp. ed. Kuehn T., III., p. 8).—**And the strong men shall bow themselves.** That is, evidently the legs, which in old age lose their muscular power; whilst in the young, strong man they may be compared to marble columns, (comp. Song of Solomon v. 10), they now shrink and become feeble, and crooked. Comp. the "crooked knees" of Job iv. 4; the "weak knees" of Ps. cix. 24; "the feeble knees," Isa. xxxv. 3; Heb. xii. 12; also 3 Mac. iv. 5. "Men of strength," is, on the contrary, a designation for valiant warriors: Judges xx. 44; 2 Sam. xi. 16; 2 Kings xxiv. 16; and to these especially strong legs are very necessary: see Ps. cxlvii. 10; 2 Sam. i. 23, *etc.*—**And the grinders cease† because they are few.** הַטֹּחֲנוֹת "the grinding maids" are to be construed as referring to the teeth, as is also shown by כִּי מִעֵטוּ, "for they have become few," and by the subsequent mention of the "sound of the mill," *i. e.*, of the human speech proceeding from the wall of the teeth (ver. 4). The closeness of the comparison between human teeth and a mill is proved by the designation "grinders," for the molar teeth in many languages, *e. g.*, in the Syriac (טחנות), in the Greek (*μύλακροι μολοδοντες*), in the Latin (*molares*). The feminine form is in allusion to the custom

---

*[Ver. 2. "*Whilst the sun or the light.*" This is not a tautology; nor does it mean the light as an element. That would be too abstract for such a writing as this. Aben Ezra gives a good interpretation in referring it to the *morning light* that precedes the sun rising. This is essentially the same with the light of the sun, but is phenomenally and poetically different.—T. L.

† Ver. 2. "*And the clouds return after the rain.*" There is no need of regarding this as denoting the winter season. It represents the subjective state of the old man. In youth the sunshine is predominant. The cloudy days are little remembered. The sun is ever coming out, or as it is expressed in the beautiful language of 2 Sam. xxiii. 4, it is ever נֹגַהּ מִמָּטָר, "clear shining after rain." In old age, especially the old age of the sensualist, who has no spiritual sun to cheer him, it is just the reverse. The clouds seem ever coming back. It is all dark, or the intervals of sunshine seem brief and evanescent.—T. L.]

*[Ver. 3. שֹׁמְרֵי הַבַּיִת, "*The keepers of the house.*" Hitzig recognizes the comparison, throughout, of the human body to a house, but he trifles when he says, that this is suggested by the mention of the rain in ver. 2, and that the figure is used because a house is made of loam and white bricks that are dissolved and worn away by the *showers*. Every thing goes to show that there is had in view, rather, the decay of some lordly mansion, the richly furnished house of some Dives, "who had fared sumptuously every day," or of a castle with its apparatus of war and luxury, as we have said p. 153.—T. L.]

*[Ver. 3. בָּטְלוּ. "*The grinders fail.*" It is rendered cease in our E. V. Zöckler, *feiern*, to rest, keep holiday. Gesenius, the same. *feriati sunt.* It is one of the words of this book reckoned to the later Hebrew. It is common, however, to all Shemitic tongues, and there is no reason why it should be regarded as either unhebraic, or as late in the Hebrew. Those who argue from its rare, or single, occurrence, should show that there is any other place in the scanty Hebrew writings we have, where it would have been more suited to the idea than the word or words used. The rendering of Zöckler and Gesenius would make it synonymous with שָׁבַת, but this is not its sense in the Arabic and Syriac, and an examination of passages would show how unsuitable it would have been as a substitute for שָׁבַת, *to cease, rest, keep holiday*, in any of the many places where the latter occurs. Its true sense is *to fail*, or rather, *to be worn out*, to *become useless*. It may, therefore, be regarded as an old Hebrew word, but as used in this place only, because it is the only one in which its peculiar sense was required.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

of all antiquity, according to which female slaves performed the grinding with hand-mills (Ex. xi. 5; Job xxxi. 10; Isa. xlvii. 2; Matt. xxiv. 41), and is also in harmony with the use of שֵׁן (tooth) as feminine, occurring in Prov. xxv. 19. —**And those that look out of the windows be darkened.** These are the *eyes*,* that are here the more fittingly designated as הָרֹאוֹת בָּאֲרֻבּוֹת, because עַיִן the "eye" is feminine, and since the eyelids, in other passages compared to the threads of a net (Prov. vi. 25), are here clearly compared to the bars of a grate or to the grating (אֲרֻבּוֹת), and since also it was very natural to present the eyes, the most noble of all our organs, as the mistresses of the house, who look quietly out into the exterior world, but the teeth on the contrary as the servants or slaves. Comp. CICERO Tusc. I., 20: *Oculi quasi fenestræ sunt animi; foramina illa, quæ patent ad animum a corpore, callidissimo artificio natura fabricata est;* also LACTANTIUS, *de opif. Dei*, c. 8; CLEMENS, *Stromata*, VII., p. 685, ℥ . See also the Cabalistic theory of the seven openings or doors of the head, of which the two sockets of the eyes are the most elevated and distinguished (JEZIRA, c. 4; comp. Talmud tract, Schabb. p. 152, col. 1; BUXTORF, *Florileg.* p. 320). Those looking out of the windows are said to be darkened with reference to the feebleness of sight in old persons, *e. g.*, Isaac (Gen. xxvii. 1), Jacob (Gen. xlviii. 10), Eli (1 Sam. iii. 2), Ahia (1 Kings xiv. 4), *etc.*; comp. also Ps. lxix. 23; Lam. v. 17; Deut. xxxiv. 7.—Ver. 4. **And the doors shall be shut in the streets.** Namely, the mouth* whose upper and lower lips are compared to the two sides or folds of a door (דְּלָתַיִם); comp. Ps. cxli. 8; Micah vii. 5; Job xli. 6. בַּשּׁוּק literally, "on the street," points to the function of the mouth as a means of communication with the outer world, whether by the reception of food or the sending out of words or other sounds As the latter reference is not so close, and would anticipate the subsequent clause, we are doubtless to think of the mouth as the organ of eating, and the shutting of the doors as an allusion to the feeble appetite of old men, [in this EWALD is correct, in opposition to KNOBEL, VAIHINGER, *etc.*]. HERZFELD and HITZIG are entirely too artificial: "the lips of the toothless mouth cling together;" but HENGSTENBERG also says: "the shutting of the doors refers to the difficulty of hearing in old men, a common infirmity with them that would not be wanting here" (?!).—**When the sound of the grinding is low.** ZÖCKLER translates: "the voice of *the mill.*" The mill is the teeth,† according to ver. 3; its voice

*[Ver. 3. "And they who look out of the windows be darkened" (הָרֹאוֹת בָּאֲרֻבּוֹת). All agree that this means the eyes in respect to the body; but what does it stand for in the figure, or parallel representation of the mansion? To this ZÖCKLER does not advert except in what he says about the "mistresses," which is very inadequate and unpicturesque. His remarks, too, about the eyelids, and "the threads of a net," with his reference to Prov. vi. 25, are fanciful prettinesses, which seem out of place in so serious yet so animated a description. The question is, what places and persons are meant? There is something here instructive of the character of the house that is pictured. As it had "its strong men," its אַנְשֵׁי הֶחָיִל, so these are the castle-watchers who look out from the turrets, or rather, *at* or *by* the turrets (ב instead of מ). If we are to be governed by the gender of רֹאוֹת, we should think of women employed for that purpose, which would suit well enough,—the strong men being otherwise employed—but the gender may have been controlled by the thought of the thing represented, the eyes, which in Hebrew, are feminine. The word, ארבות, does not mean the ordinary windows of a house (חַלּוֹנִים), but some opening high up, in the roof, or in a turret. This is shown from all its uses, as in Gen. vii. 11, viii. 12, 2 Kings vii. 19, Isa. xxiv. 15, Malachi iii. 10, in all of which places it is rendered the windows of heaven (supposed openings in the sky) Hosea xiii. 3, where it means *chimneys*, and Isa. lx. 8, where it is used diminutively for the *openings* in the dove houses. Here, therefore, it must mean *turret* windows or openings, where the watchers are stationed, and this is in harmony with the usual sense of the verb ארב, to *lie in wait*, to *watch*. There is a striking pictorial propriety in this which has led to similar representations by other ancient writers. "Thus" the sight (says PLATO in the *Timæus*, 90 A), "as the noblest of the senses, is placed in the highest part" ἐπ' ἄκρῳ τῷ σώματι. So CICERO *De Nat. Deorum*, II., 140, *Sensus autem, interpretes ac nuntii rerum, in capite, tanquam in arce, collocuti sunt:* "The senses, as interpreters and messengers of things without, are placed in the head as in a *watch tower.*" "And this," he says, "is especially true of the eyes as watchers:" *nam oculi, tanquam speculatores, altissimum locum obtinent, ex quo plurima conspicientes funguntur suo munere.* Compare also *Xenophon Memorabilia* Lib. I., ch. iv. 11, where we have the same idea as in the well-known passage from *Ovid Met.* I., 85:

Os homini sublime dedit, cœlumque tueri,
Jussit, et erectos ad sidera tollere vultus.—T. L.]

*[Ver. 4. "*And the doors shall be shut in the streets;*" or rather, "the doors to the street" (the street doors) are shut (*becoming shut, closing*; see Metrical Version). The reference of this to the mouth, which began with JEROME, has been the occasion of much false interpretation, both here and in what follows. The dual number is just as applicable to the eyes and ears as to the lips. It agrees, therefore, far better with the whole context, to take it as HENGSTENBERG does, of the ears closing to sounds, or rather, of all the senses, as the avenues to the outer world. To say that this is too remote or abstract a sense for Koheleth, is to overlook the whole scope of this most thoughtful representation, and to fail in appreciating the spirit of its grand poetry. The old sensualist, he who had lived so much *abroad*, and so little at home, is shut in at last. Again, the language is inconsistent with the other and more limited view. With no propriety could the mouth be called the *street door*, through which the master of the house goes abroad: especially when regarded, as this interpretation mainly regards the mouth, in its eating or masticating function. It is rather the door to the interior, the cellar door, that leads down to the stored or consumed provision, the stomach, or belly. The word בַּשּׁוּק whether we render it *in* the street, or *to* the street, would be altogether out of place in such a narrow view, and more especially since שׁוּק has such a wide meaning (*platea*, wide place, *foras*, abroad), comp. v. 5, Prov. vii. 5, Cantic. iii. 2. —T. L.]

†[Ver. 4. "*When the sound of the grinding is low.*" In ver. 3 the טֹחֲנוֹת, or female servants who grind the meal in the rich mansion, undoubtedly represent the teeth; that is, the term is directly metaphorical. Here, on the other hand, הַטַּחֲנָה, the grinding, or the mill, is not so much metaphorical as illustrative. It is to be taken, therefore, in its primary sense as a fact showing the old man's dullness of hearing. The most familiar and household sounds, such as that of the grinding mill, are faintly distinguished. The making it represent the mouth masticating, as a mill grinding, has given rise to a great many disagreeable and very unpoetical images, marring, as STUART admits, the otherwise admirable propriety, or keeping, of the picture. The mill, it is said, is the old man's collapsed mouth; the low sound of the grinding is the mumbling noise made by his feeble chewing, the "sinking daughters of song" are his feeble piping. Commentators seem to have vied with each other here in the exercise of their ingenuity. Some of these most unpoetical critics have referred the low grinding sound to the rumbling noises in the belly and stomach arising from poor digestion (see their names in GEIER, also the commentators cited in POLE'S *Synopsis*). STUART says truly: "none of these interpretations (whether referring to the chewing or the piping, or the digestion) are very inviting," and yet he is not prepared to give any other. He says well that "eating seems to be dispatched in the 3d verse, and there is an incongruity

Digitized by Google

is not, however, the noise caused by the chewing of food—which would be very harsh and unnatural (contrary to Ewald, *et al.*), but human speech breathed out, as it were, from the wall of the teeth [ἕρκος ὀδόντων], that voice which in old age usually becomes weaker and lower.—**And he shall rise up at the voice of the bird.** Zöckler translates: "and it seems like the voice of the sparrow." Ewald and Hitzig are correct [in regard to the impersonal rendering of יָקוּם] with reference to Isa. xxix. 24, where also a weak voice is compared to the low chirping, if not of the sparrow, at least of some other small birds. It is usually rendered (*Sept.*, *Vulg.*, Luther, Knobel, Vaihinger, *etc.*: "and he rises up at the voice of the birds," *i. e.*, in the early morning—which might also afford an allusion to the sleeplessness of old men. But it is more than doubtful whether קוּם לְקוֹל הַצִּפּוֹר should express this sense of early rising. Instead of יָקוּם we should in that case have expected יָעִיר. And early rising is by no means a general custom of old men, and—what seems more weighty than all the rest—the *context* requires a reference to the low, whispering speech of old men; see the following clause. For קוּם לְ in the sense here given to it, comp. Zeph. iii. 8; 1 Sam. xxii. 13.—**And all the daughters of music shall be brought low**, that is, all the songs in which the old man endeavors to join, but which he utters only with a trembling, and scarcely audible voice. The "daughters" of a thing means in Hebrew style its special or specific announcement or utterance; comp. the Rabbinic בַּת קוֹל as well as the expression "Son of fruitfulness," Isa. v. 1, *etc.* Hitzig is correct, and Hengstenberg substantially so, who understands by the "daughters of song" the qualities required in singing. But Knobel is arbitrary, who, with Herzfeld, sees in the singers only singing birds (according to which the failing here described would be the deafness of the old man); Vaihinger sees an allusion to the organs of singing; and, finally, Umbreit and Elster understand the passage to be about the low flight of birds, and their uneasy fluttering at an approaching thunder storm.—Ver. 5. The discourse continues to depend on בְּיוֹם שֶׁ at the beginning of the third verse, if not grammatically, at least logically.—**Also when they shall be afraid of that which is high**; *i. e.*, of ascending an eminence which would be difficult on account of their sunken chests, and short breath; a remark in sympathy with what precedes concerning the feeble voice of old men. Nearly all modern commentators are correct on this point, as is now Ewald, who formerly translated: "when they shall be afraid of the Lofty One," that is of God, the one supremely lofty.—**And fears shall be in the way**; namely, "threaten" them, "meet" them, who are too lame and weak easily too avoid such frights. For the abstract form of the plural חַתְחַתִּים, see Ewald, § 179, a.—**And the almond tree shall flourish.** Thus we must, without doubt, translate the words יָנֵאץ הַשָּׁקֵד, for יָנֵץ (Hiphil of נצץ). For this compare Ewald, § 15, a.;

in supposing it to be again introduced here." The incongruity is all the greater from bringing this lowest part of the human econom, (even if it had not already had place enough) between the two noblest senses; for what follows (בנות השיר), undoubtedly refers to the hearing; or else (which would indeed be most strange) there is no notice taken at all of this most important function. We would not hesitate, therefore, to refer this clause also to that sense. There is, too, a wonderful pictorial propriety in it, when we consider the important part which this *grinding*, and its constant sound, must have borne in an ancient wealthy mansion. From the want of outside mills, this domestic occupation was in coutinual demand for the daily provisioning; and, in a large house, or castle, it must have employed a great many servants. It was generally done by women, and to this our Saviour refers, Matt. xxiv. 41, Luke xvii. 35: "Two women shall be grinding together." They must have been constantly at work to supply the demand for bread at every meal. Day and night "the sound of the grinding" was heard, like that which proceeded from the tired and drowsy female slaves in the house of Ulysses; as described in the *Odyssey* XX., 109:

> Αἱ μεν ἄρ' ἄλλαι εὗδον, ἐπεὶ κατὰ πυρὸν ἄλεσσαν,
> Ἡ' δὲ μί' ὄυπω παύετ', ἀφαυροτάτη δ' ἐτέτυκτο,
> 'Η ρα μυλην στήσασα, ἔπος φάτο, σῆμα ἄνακτι.

> The rest had lain them down to sleep, their weary task was done;
> One still kept on the ceaseless toil, the weakest of them all;
> When suddenly she stopped the mill, and spake aloud the sign.

The account is very touching. It is very late at night, and near the dawn. These poor wearied creatures, who had been grinding all day for the rapacious suitors, finish their long tasks, one after another, and lie down, overcome by fatigue and drowsiness, until one alone is left in her late hour of toil. In answer to the prayer of Ulysses, Zeus had given the signal thunder in the early cloudless sky. Startled at the sound she stops the mill, and hails it as a signal of deliverance, whilst Ulysses recognizes her words as an auspicious omen.

There was hardly any part of the day or night when this work was not going on with its ceaseless noise. It was, indeed, a sign, then, that the senses were failing in their office (בְּטֵלִים), when this familiar, yet very peculiar, sound of the grinding had ceased to arrest the attention, or had become low and obscure.

> When the hum of the mill is faintly heard,
> And the daughters of song are still.

It is from this, too, that the words וְיָקוּם לְקוֹל הַצִּפּוֹר, which have been so much misunderstood, get their clearest exposition. יָקוּם has for its subject, not the old man, but "the sound of the grinding," the last grammatical antecedent, and it presents a contrast, as Hitzig says, with שפל preceding, as well as with יָשֹׁחוּ following. "Though it *rise* to the sparrow's note"—"*attain unto*," as קוּם, with לְ following, is used Zeph. iii. 8, 1 Sam. xxii. 13, Mic. ii. 8,—referring not so much to loudness, or volume of sound, as to that sharp, shrill noise which was ever ringing in the ears of others. Its real sound, shrill as the sparrow's voice, is put in contrast with the dull droning sound that reaches the old man's ears. What follows would seem to put this interpretation beyond doubt. The term daughter (בת) is used in Hebrew, not as Zöckler takes it, but to intensify, to give the very best of a thing. בְּנוֹת הַשִּׁיר, "daughters of song," then, does not necessarily mean singers, though it may have that sense, but may be understood of "the loudest songs," or the loudest voices in the song. They are faintly heard; יָשֹׁחוּ they *sink down*. The sound they make to the old man is exactly represented by the same word, Isaiah xxix. 4, where we have also שפל used as it is here: "And thou shalt speak low out of the ground (שָׁפַלְתְּ תְּדַבֵּרִי), and thy speech shall sound low (תִּשַּׁח shall *sink* down) out of the dust, and thy voice shall be as of one that hath a familiar spirit, out of the ground, and shall whisper out of the dust." See Metrical Version.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

§ 141, b. The almond tree bears its blossoms in the midst of winter,* and on a naked, leafless stem, and these blossoms (reddish or flesh-colored in the beginning) seem at the time of their fall exactly like white snow-flakes; (BODENSTEDT, 1001 *Days in the Orient*, II., p. 237). In this way the almond blossom is a very fitting symbol of old age with its silvery hair, and its wintry, dry, barren and unfruitful condition. EWALD, HEILIGSTEDT, VAIHINGER, and GURLITT, are correct; the first-named makes an appropriate reference to Philo, *de vita Mosis* iii. 22.—HENGSTENBERG'S view is too far-fetched in finding in the words (according to Jerem. i. 11) the wakefulness, or sleepless nights of hoary old age; whilst SCHRÖDER, GESENIUS, DIETRICH, *et al.*, consider יָנֵאץ as intrans. Fut. Hiph. from נאץ, and render: "And the almond is despised" (by the toothless old man who cannot bite it): others undertake emendations, *e. g.*, GAAB, who reads יִנָּאֵץ "is despised," HITZIG, who points it יְנָאֵץ and thus obtains the scarcely intelligible sense: "And the Almond tree refuses," *i. e.*, does not permit the weak old man to obtain its fruit (which is to be understood according to the analogy of the Song of Solomon vii. 9). Still others, finally, force an unusual sense on the word שָׁקֵד as HAHN, who understands and translates it "the waking," referring it to the human mind; "the waking one acquires pinions," which is about equivalent to saying: "The previously half-wakened spirit is, in the moment of death, released unto clear life and full liberty" (against which explanation is the absence elsewhere of any Hiphil denominative הֵנֵץ from נוֹצָה "pinion."—**And the Grasshopper shall be a burden** (ZÖCKLER renders "burdensome"), on account of its singing and chirping, or also on account of its hopping flight and creeping. חָגָב literally, "locust," but here more fittingly translated by grasshopper, because, in rendering locust, it is most probably the comparative smallness, as in Isa. xl. 22; Numb. xiii. 34, which is mainly considered (as though we should say: "And the gnat becomes a burden, or the fly"). For יִסְתַּבֵּל (fut. Hithpa of סבל) "to become a burden," comp. GESENIUS in the *Thesaurus*. KIMCHI is correct regarding this, and he is followed by GURLITT, especially among modern authors, and approximately also by GESENIUS and HENGSTENBERG, of whom, however, the former thinks of the burdensomeness of the locust as an article of food, whilst the latter prefers to have locust understood figuratively in the sense of influences hostile to life. The numerous remaining hypotheses are to be decidedly rejected; they are divided into two groups, according as they interpret the locust as a symbol of the old man himself, that is as to the form of his body, or seek to alter the sense of חָגָב by peculiar explanations. To the former group belong the Septuagint, Vulgate, Syriac, *etc.*, which agree in the signification that "the locust becomes fat" (swells up), and understand the whole, though in opposition to the true signification of הסתבל as a biblical representation of the corpulency of old men; and 2. those of LUTHER, GEIER, VAIHINGER, *etc.*, who explain locust to mean the crooked or bent skeleton and spinal column of man in old age, and therefore translate: "The locust is burdened;" and 3. that of HITZIG: "And the jumper permits himself to be carried," *i. e.*, the one formerly hopping merrily about can no longer walk: 4. that of OETINGER: "the locust becomes a burden to itself," *i. e.*, "drags its body about with difficulty; 5. those of EWALD, HEILIGSTEDT, and HAHN, who agree in making locust point to the inner body, or to the mind of man (EWALD): and "the locust rises," namely to fly; HEILIGSTEDT: "*et tollit se ad volandum locusta;*" HAHN: "And the locust unburdens itself," which is equivalent to our expression: "And the butterfly bursts its cocoon." Among the second class we may count such illustrations as the Chaldaic, and that of Aben Ezra: "when the ankle-bones become thick;" that of BOCHART, "when the bones of the legs become heavy;" and of KNOBEL: "and the breathing is a burden" (the last two on the basis of a peculiar signification of חגב derived from the Arabic).* —**And desire shall fail**, that is, when neither the appetite nor sexual desire can be excited by so strong a stimulant as the caper-berry. As

* [Ver. 5. וְיָנֵאץ הַשָּׁקֵד, ZÖCKLER well defends here the old interpretation. The other mode of exegesis gives a poor and mean image, marring the poetry, and exceedingly far-fetched as a supposed trait of old age; whereas the comparison of the hoary head to a flowering tree is very striking, as well as natural. The old man's mouth, and eating powers had been treated of before (*ad nauseam*, we might say, if, with some critics, we allow a second reference to it in ver. 4, as well as in ver. 3), whilst it would indeed be a wonder if so marked a characteristic as the gray head had been wholly omitted. By changing the punctuation to יְנָאֵץ, these critics would render it "the almond disgusts;" it is too hard a nut for the the old man's teeth to crack; or "the almond disgusts," because it is "sour grapes" to the old man; it grows so high he cannot get at it. For other incongruous imagery, see HITZIG and STUART. In regard to the orthography, whilst רְאֵם for רֵם (see Numb. xxiii. 22, Ps. xxix. 6, Ps. xxii. 22) presents a parallel to נֵאץ or נִאֵץ for נֵץ, the other view of יָנֵאץ for יְנָאֵץ is wholly unexampled. The objection from the color of the almond blossoms is well answered by ZÖCKLER. These difficulties settled, what can be more striking than the metaphor! A good parallel to it is found in SOPHOCLES' *Electra* 42, where it is said of the Tutor,

Οὐ γάρ σε μὴ γήρᾳ τε καὶ μακρῷ χρόνῳ
Γνῶσ', οὐδ' ὑποπτεύσουσιν, ὧδ' ΗΝΘΙΣΜΕΝΟΝ:

They'll know thee not,
Through age and time thus blossomed;
Nor even have suspicion who thou art.

Some would explain this of the flowers and garlands he is supposed to wear as a messenger: but the critical reader must see that this would be altogether out of keeping with the circumstances, as there detailed, and especially with the sad message he was supposed to bear. The other objection, made by BOTHE, that it would be a tautology with γήρᾳ (age), is very trifling. It is the very nature of poetry thus to intensify, and often by what would be tautology in prose. WUNDER gives an explanation from FR. JACOBSIUS, which refutes completely his own criticism, and that of BOTHE. He cites examples that put the meaning of SOPHOCLES beyond a doubt; as from *Cyril c. Julian* VI., p. 157, ὅτε λευκῇ πολιᾷ κατηνθισμένος; and another, where the same figure is applied to the beard, *De Chryse sene Christodor. Ecphr.* 90:

βαθὺς δὲ οἱ ἤνθεε πώγων.

Modern poetry has the same metaphor.—T. L.]

* [Most of these hypotheses seem absurd, and all of them inconsistent with the simplicity and directness of the whole picture. After all, none of them seem so obvious as that which is given by some Jewish commentators, and suggests itself directly from our common English Version: namely, that it is a hyperbolical expression of feebleness. "He cannot bear the least weight."—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

אֲבִיּוֹנָה has the meaning of "Caper" (κάππαρις) by the testimony of the oldest translators as well as of the Rabbins (comp. BUXTORF, *Lex Rabb. et Talm.*, p. 12, 2098), and as the use of the berries or buds of the caper-bush undoubtedly stimulate the appetite, and, according to the ancient oriental representation a voluptuous desire (comp. also PLUTARCH, *Sympos.*, 6; WINER, *Real Lexicon, Art. Caper*), the correctness of this interpretation is not to be doubted, and LUTHER's translation: "and all desire fails," appears at least consonant with the sense. Varying interpretations: 1) Septuagint, Vulgate, Syriac, Arabic; ROSENMUELLER, HEILIGSTEDT, EWALD, VAIHINGER: "and the caper bursts," *i. e.*, the spirit presses forth as a kernel from the husk; 2. Vers. Veneta (παύσῃ ἡ ὄρεξις) ABULWALID, LUTHER, HENGSTENBERG, *etc.*: "Since desire fails;" 3. SCHMIDT, DÖDERLEIN, *etc.*: "since the turtle-dove, the messenger of spring is despised;" 4. HAHN: "Since the poor one (fem. of אֶבְיוֹן) bursts forth," *i. e.*, since the imprisoned soul bursts its prison, its mortal coil, *etc.* KNOBEL, HITZIG, and GURLITT are correct among the modern writers.—**Because man goeth to his long home, and the mourners go about the streets.** Clearly a parenthesis by which the previous description of the infirmities of age, especially that contained in the last three clauses, is strengthened by pointing to the imminent approach of death for the old man. **Man passeth away,** (הֹלֵךְ) *i. e.*, he is on the point of going; comp. Gen. xix. 13, 14, *etc.* "His long home" is the grave, from which there is no more return to earthly life (comp. Job vii. 10; Ps. xlix. 12; Isa. xiv. 18, *etc.*). The same appellation is also found in Tob. iii. 6; Targ. Jonath. in Jes. xlii. 11; among the Egyptians (Diodorus Sic., i. 51), among the Arabians (Koran, Sur. xli. 28) and the Romans (*domus æterna; marmorea domus, Tibull. Carm.*, III., 2, 22).

[THE ETERNAL HOUSE.—Ver. 5. בֵּית עֹלָמוֹ. ZÖCKLER's interpretation of this striking expression is scanty and misleading. It cannot, any more than Sheol, mean the grave simply. Without insisting upon the fact that the Hebrews had for that a distinct term (קֶבֶר), when nothing more was intended (see Bibelwerk Gen. 586), it may be said that the context almost immediately following is at war with such an idea. The expression here, had it stood alone, might have been regarded, perhaps, as a figurative one for extinction of all being. The "long home" might have been thought to denote the dark house of bodily dissolution and spiritual nothingness; though still it would be a question whether language, thus implying residence, permanence, and something like continuance of selfhood, could ever, even in figure, have arisen from such a nihility of conception. What is said, however, in ver. 7, forbids it altogether. The being of man, though one and inseparable in personality, is there regarded as locally divided: "The dust goes down to the earth, the spirit returns unto God who gave it." Now to predicate this residence of the dissolving dust alone does not satisfy the conception. The passage, Job vii. 10, to which ZÖCKLER refers, has no application, whatever; Isaiah xiv. 18 is only a highly figurative representation of the remains of monarchs, lying in state, or in their splendid mausoleums, and the בֵּית מוֹעֵד of Job xxx. 23, "the house of meeting," or of "the assembly," which he might more properly have cited, has the same meaning as in this place; and every argument against regarding it as the mere place of deposit for the decomposing remains, which are not man in any sense, is as applicable to the one place as to the other. There is equal difficulty in regarding it as any separate mansion of the spirit by itself. Neither can be said to be *man*, the personality, the self-hood, when separately viewed: and yet it is man himself that has gone to the house of his olam, or rather to his olamic house; since the pronoun in עֹלָמוֹ belongs to the whole compound taken as one epithet. God is spoken of as the מָעוֹן, "the dwelling-place" of His people (see Ps. xc. 1), but that cannot be the sense intended here; neither, on the other hand, can the "spirit's return to God" be regarded as a pantheistic absorption, as ZÖCKLER well shows. No theism was ever more clear of such an idea, or more opposed to Buddhism, whether in its ancient eastern, or its modern transcendental form, than that of the old Hebrews. Although in the Old Testament God is represented as אֱלֹהֵי רוּחוֹת (Numb. xvi. 22) "God of spirits," yet it would seem to go even to the extremes in setting forth His distinct and incommunicable personality, His unapproachable *holiness*, that is, His separation from all things, and all beings, even the highest whom He has created, or to whom He has given being. As it cannot, therefore, apply separately, either to the soul or the body, the term beth-olam must denote something consistent with such a modified being of both. It is clear, then, that it cannot express *locality*, nor even duration as such, but a *state of being*, unknown except as obscurely defined in what follows (ver. 7), though positive as a fact. This state of being is so called in distinction from the present being upon earth. Although the idea of place is thus excluded, yet the word בית is used as suggested by the previous figure of the decaying mansion. The "earthly house," ἡ ἐπίγειος ἡμῶν οἰκία, is dissolved, and now man goes to the οἰκία αἰώνιος, the olamic house, not under the law of space and time, "the house not made with hands,"—whatever it may mean, whether the same as, or less than, Paul intends by the use of similar language. The term beth-olam, however it may have been suggested here, is in striking accordance with the corresponding classical Greek usage of οἶκος 'Αΐδου (Homeric, δῶμ' 'Αΐδαο, 'Αΐδος δόμος) representing the other *world*, or the other condition of being, as a house, a home, or abode, though unseen and unknown. This was its pure primary sense and usage, denoting *state* alone, though afterwards the poetry and mythology gave it scenery and locality. עולם here corresponds to Hades in etymological significance, as well as in its manner of usage. It is the *hidden*, the unmeasured, as that is the unseen.

Digitized by Google

The idea of time, though in general inseparable, from עולם, is not here predominant. It certainly does not denote an absolute, endless eternity. And so another phrase, ἀΐδιος οἴκησις, as used in Greek (DIODORUS, XENOPHON, and PLATO: see Gen. p. 587) is etymologically the *unseen*, though coming to be used for eternal, or æonian, through the near relation, and frequent blending of the Hadean and the æonian, or olamic conceptions.

The view, then, of this phrase בית עולם which is least liable to objection, or on which we can most safely rely, is that which is content with regarding it as simply the antithesis of this present worldly state of being. There is suggested the same rendering (*world*) which we have given chap. i. 11, iii. 11, and ix. 7. It is the other *world* in distinction from this, whether regarded as lying parallel or as succeeding. It is the house in which the dead (who yet have some unknown being) are to abide, while the world lasts (even this world) as we have rendered לעולם. ix. 7, in the Metrical Version.

Whilst the world lasts, no portion more have they,
In all the works performed beneath the sun.

In the same manner also, in our modern language, do we speak of *this world*, and *the other world*. We use the latter term in two ways; 1) as the great *world*, or olam, which, as a whole, is historically to succeed this as a whole that shall have passed away; or 2) as the *world* into which each individual goes at death,—as though the finishing with *this* were virtually the entrance into *that*, although its historical manifestation for all men collectively may yet be far remote. Our mode of speech has not come from the Bible,—certainly not from the English Bible,—for its general mode of translating עולם vaguely by *forever* and *everlasting*, and its avoiding the rendering *world*, are unfavorable to it. It is a thought born in the modern as in the ancient mind, and existing from the earliest ages. It was accompanied by no knowledge, yet none the less tenaciously held. It was the goal of the Patriarch's pilgrimage idea. They were "going to Sheol," to the *other world*, yet all unknowing as Abraham was, when, at the command of God, he went out from Mesopotamia: ἐξῆλθε μὴ ἐπιστάμενος πῦν ἔρχεται, Heb. xi. 8. So "went they out" (from this world), confiding in God, hoping "for a better country," yet "not knowing whither they went," or having the least conception, perhaps, of the mode of being that was to follow.

We are simply told of the fact: man goes to the olam, the beth-olam, to the other world, and there the Old Testament leaves him; and leaves the interpreter to give it as high or as low a sense as his spiritual-mindedness or lack of spiritual-mindedness may lead him to prefer. It speaks of it as a *state*, but throws no light upon it as a *mode* of being. It is not wholly a blank, but in almost everything we deem of highest worldly importance, it is set forth as the opposite of the present life. These images, however, of stillness, unknowingness, (not to say unconsciousness), inactivity, want of interest, in a word, lack of vitality, as we would call it, and which would seem to reduce it almost to an embryo existence (see ix. 5, and note p. 129), may be because the impossibility of our conceiving it aright, and the consequent veil of reserve which the old Scripture throws over the whole subject, leaves little else to the picturing imagination than a description of negatives. Any premature development in the other direction might have falsely stimulated the fancy, and led the divinely guarded people of God into many of those wild conceptions which so deform the Heathen mythologies of Hades, or the world of the dead.

In respect to other great ideas, however, as connected with such a state, the Old Testament is by no means silent. In some places it would seem to speak of death as though it were the end of man, as indeed it is of life, like the present. But again, it sets forth duties to God and man that cannot be measured by time, a law for the spirit, so searching, so high and holy as to seem incompatible with a mere finite earthly animal being; it speaks of *relations* to Deity, of awful accountabilities, that have no meaning, or that greatly collapse in their significance, if there be not for man another olam, another and greater state of being, either in itself, or to which it is preparatory. It never turns aside to explain any such seeming inconsistencies. Sublime in its reserve, in its types and shadows, in its mere hints of a post-mundane human destiny, as in its clearest announcements, this most suggestive Old Scripture goes on its majestic way, fearing no charge of contradiction, taking no pains to make any explicit provision against Sadducean cavils, and leaving the matter wholly to that spiritual discernment which the Saviour manifested (Matt. xxii. 23-33) against those who sought to entangle him with verbal and casuistical difficulties. One great truth of this kind stands prominently out. It is the idea of a judgment, somewhere, and at some time in the great æon of æons, the kingdom of God. This is especially the case in Koheleth, and all that is dark in the book is relieved by this one thought so firmly adhered to, so positively stated, so distinct in itself, or as a fact, yet so undefined in time, locality, and circumstance, as to make it extremely difficult for one who should demand attention to these in defending its consistency.—T. L.]

The mourners going about the streets, is a vivid description of the preparations for a great funeral, which are often made by his heirs for a mortally sick old man even before his decease. With this explanation, (agreeing substantially with HITZIG) it is not necessary, with HENGSTENBERG, to consider וְסָבְבוּ as relative future, and therefore to translate: "The mourners will soon go about." For the mourning customs of the ancient Hebrews consult Amos v. 16; Isa. xv. 33; Jer. ix. 16 ff.; Matt. ix. 23; xi. 17, *etc.*—Verses 6 and 7, following the description of hoary age, give that of his final end in death, and in such a way that the dissolution of the spiritual-bodily organism is first described in ver. 6 in a variety of figures, and then literally or in accordance with its inner nature. In syntactical relation the two verses run parallel with ver. 2, the construction there begun with עַד אֲשֶׁר לֹא "before," "being taken up again."—**Or ever the**

silver cord be loosed—*i. e.*, before the thread of life is ruptured. The thread of life is here designated as a silver cord, and not as a tent-cord (which keeps the tent from falling together, see Job iv. 21; Isa. xxxviii. 12), because the author imagines the living one, or rather his living organism, as a golden lamp hanging by a silver cord, as the sequel shows. Both figures, however, point, through the noble metals of which they speak, to human life as a valuable and noble possession; comp. the association of gold and silver in Prov. xxv. 11.—Read יֵרָחֵק* *discessit longe recessit* ("gives way"), not יֵרָתֵק ("is unbound"), as the K'ri has it; nor יִרְחַק as it stands in the text, nor יִנָּתֵק ["is torn asunder"](PFANNKUCHE), nor יֵחָרֵק as HITZIG has it. These emendations are rendered unnecessary by the simplicity and perspicuity of the text.—**Or the golden bowl be broken.**—גֻּלָּה is literally equivalent to גַּל "fountain" (comp. Song of Solomon iv. 12 with Joshua xv. 19 and Judges i. 15); in Zach. iv. 3 it signifies a vessel for oil, or an oil lamp, and is so to be considered here. The human body is therefore considered as a vessel in which is contained, as in a lamp, the oil, the blood, which is the supporter of the soul or of life [comp. Lev. xvii. 14]. Like the precious oil of Zechariah, iv. 3, which is called "golden oil," so "is the blood the noble, precious fluid in the human organism;" and with reference to it as the condition of life and health, the organism itself is called גֻּלַּת הַזָּהָב "the golden bowl." HENGSTENBERG and HITZIG both maintain that this expression of the author here seems to be materially affected and modified by this passage in Zechariah iv. 2 ff.—**And the pitcher broken at the fountain.**—The pitcher [כַּד] is not identical with the golden bowl, and therefore a figurative designation of the whole body, but only of a special organ of it; of that one, namely, with which we draw air or breath, that is, nourish the body from the fountain of all life that surrounds it. The previous figure is now abandoned, or rather insensibly changed into one nearly allied to it; the burning flame of the golden lamp becomes the invisible inner flame of the process of respiration, whose physical organ is the lungs. Its destruction in death is figuratively described as the breaking (הִשָּׁבֵר) of the pitcher at the fountain, from which it had hitherto daily drawn water,—wherein there clearly appears an amplification of the expression as compared with the preceding form; comp. שבר in Isa. xlii. 3.—**Or the wheel broken at the cistern.**—Not a new figure, but only a more special illustration of the one just presented. The "wheel at the fountain" is the cistern wheel by which the bucket is raised or lowered, and cannot have a specific reference to any definite organ of the body, but symbolizes organic life itself in its continuous circle, just as "the wheel of birth" of James iii. 6 (τρόχος τῆς γενέσεως) based probably on this passage. The cistern (הַבּוֹר) is not materially different from the fountain (מַבּוּעַ) and likewise means the air surrounding man and affording the most indispensable of all conditions of life, namely, breath; it does not mean the whole world, as HENGSTENBERG maintains, or the grave, as some others think.—אֶל־הַבּוֹר is moreover the same as עַל הַבּוֹר "at the fountain," comp. 1 Sam. xx. 25; 2 Sam. ii. 9 ff. Observe also the passive נָרֹץ instead of the earlier active, תָּרֹץ; it means that the golden bowl "breaks," as it were, of its own accord, as soon as the silver cord that holds it is loosed; but the wheel "is broken," is destroyed at the same time with the whole machinery of life, by an act of violence operating from without.*—In older

*[The K'tib, or text as it stands in Niphal, יֵרָחֵק, is better, [illegible] it has something of a passive or rather deponent sense: "is parted"—"parts," intransitively, or "parts itself,"—*elongabitur*. It is the idea of giving way from stretching, or attenuation. The other various readings and renderings, as ZÖCKLER says, are useless.—T. L.]

*[ZÖCKLER's general comment here is judicious and safe. Attempts to be more particular are apt to mislead into fanciful error. And yet there remains the impression from the whole, and especially from the evident particularity in the first four verses, that certain parts or functions of the body are directly intended by the golden bowl, the bucket at the spring, and the wheel at the cistern. The ancients had more knowledge of the human anatomy than we give them credit for. The Egyptians must have learned much from their continual processes of embalming. It would appear also from HOMER's minute and varied descriptions of wounds, and especially in passages from ARISTOTLE and PLATO that show even a scientific knowledge of the human system. There is, for example, a passage of some length in the Timæus, extending from 70 B to 76 E, containing quite a full description of the more vital internal parts and their uses, with some things much resembling what we find here. In the assigning, too, of different spiritual powers and affections to different parts of the body, as though it were a kind of civil corporation, the author of the Timæus reminds us of JOHN BUNYAN and his town of Man-soul. Solomon's golden bowl, too, is suggested, when we read in the Timæus how the θεῖον σπέρμα, the "divine seed" of life was moulded into a round shape, and made the ἐγκέφαλος, or brain: and there are other things about the fluids and their περίοδοι, or circulations, that call up what is here said about the wheel and the fountain. Neither is there to be ridiculed and wholly rejected the idea which some have entertained that Solomon referred to the circulation of the blood. We need not suppose that he had anticipated HARVEY's great discovery; but the general idea that the human system had its period [or, to use ARISTOTLE's language before quoted, p. 46, that every organism was in the nature of a cycle, something going round and returning into itself] was a very early one. It came not so much from scientific or inductive observation, as from a sort of *a priori* thinking: so it *must* be; to constitute a living, or even an organic thing, there must be some such going round and round, to keep it from running out or perishing. It was this mode of thinking that showed itself in language, as in the Rabbinic גלגל תולדות and the τροχὸς γενεσεως, the "wheel of generation" of James iii. 6, to which ZÖCKLER refers.

As a lesson, however, to those who are inclined to be extravagant here, nothing can be more judicious than the remarks of MAIMONIDES in the Preface to his *More Nevochim*, where he tells those who would demand a minute explanation of every part of a *mashal* or parable—such, for example, as Prov. vii. 6–23—that "they will either miss the general thought, or get wearied in seeking particular illustrations of things that cannot be explained, and thus utterly fail in their vain attempt to get from the writer what perhaps never came into his mind."

On the whole, therefore, we cannot expect to get a much better interpretation of this passage than that early one given by JEROME: *Funiculus autem argenti candidam hanc vitam, et spiramen quod nobis de cœlo tribuitur, ostendit; Phiala quoque aurea animam significat, quæ illuc recurrit unde descenderat, etc.:* "The silver cord denotes the pure life and respiration [inspiration] which was given to us from heaven; the golden bowl also means the soul which returns whence it had descended; the breaking of the bucket at the fountain, and the shattering of the wheel at the cistern, are enigmatical metaphors of death; for as when the bucket which is worn out ceases to draw, and the wheel by which the waters are raised is broken, the flow of the water is in-

Digitized by Google

commentators there are many arbitrary physiological and anatomical interpretations of the respective points of the description: MELANCHTHON sees in the silver cord the nerves and sinews, in the golden fountain the heart, and in the pitcher at the fountain, the great vein over the liver; PRAUN [*Physico-Anatomica Analysis*, Cap. XII., *Ecclesiastes*] thinks the silver cord the lacteal vessel of the breast, and WITSIUS the golden bowl the brain, whilst WEDEL makes it the heart, and HOTTINGER refers it to the gall. Since HARVEY'S discovery of the circulation of the blood, many have seen this pictured in the golden bowl as in the fountain (JABLONSKI, HANSEN, MICHAELIS, STARKE, SCHEUCHZER, *etc.*), and have mingled many strange things with it, *e. g.:* the pitcher is the liver (WITSIUS), or the lymph (WEDEL), or the stomach (HOTTINGER), or the chyle (PRAUN, SCHEUCHZER); the wheel signifies the kidneys, urinary passages, and bladder (WEDEL), or the peristaltic motions of the bowels (SCHEUCHZER), or the motion of the lungs (SIBEL, JABLONSKI). Look especially at STARKE on this passage, and also at the Exegetical monographs quoted on page 27.—**Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was.**—Namely, as dust; comp. Gen. iii. 19; Ps. civ. 29; Job xxxiv. 15, to which passages, especially the first named, Koheleth conforms in expression. For the form וְיָשֹׁב comp. EWALD, § 343 *b*.—**And the spirit shall return unto God who gave it.***—Namely, as the life-giving principle in the human organism, comp. Gen. ii. 7; Ps. civ. 30; Isa. xlii. 5; Jer. xxxviii. 16 This passage does not expressly affirm a personal immortality of the human soul, but it also does not deny it; for that the author is thinking of a pantheistic floating of the soul in the universal spirit, and that, "separated into individual existence, this particle of the Divine breath poured forth into the world by God will again be drawn to Him, and thus again unite with His breath, the soul of the world" (HITZIG)—all this, only rationalistic extravagance, can find in this passage. Koheleth's earlier testimonies rather show him to have thought of the return of the spirit to God as an entrance into the presence and eternal communion of God, and not as an absorption by God. And the arrival of the departed ones into the dark Scheol separating them from Divine light and life, so depicted in chap. ix., evidently appears to him only a provisional and intermediate condition which will finally be followed by an eternal existence with God after that "judgment" (chap. xi. 9). Compare VAIHINGER: "According to this the coming to God seems, in the conception of the Preacher, to be gradual, and the view in Ps. xlix. 6 to have been in his mind, *viz.:* that the good will be liberated from Scheol, and, after being acquitted in the judgment, will live blessed in God. Ps. xvii. 15, whilst the wicked will be cast back into Scheol after the judgment, and there eternally remain, Ps. xlix. 15;* Luke xvi. 22 ff." HENGSTENBERG says: "It is impossible that at the period of death the hitherto so marked difference between the just and the wicked will be suddenly effaced. The sharp earnestness with which the judgment of this world is every where announced, and especially in this book, decides against this. After all this, after the impressive emphasizing of the retributive justice of God, in which the entire book ends in ver. 14, the return of the soul to God can only be that spoken of by the Apostle in 2 Cor. v. 10; Rom. xiv. 10; Heb. ix. 27." It is noteworthy also that the *Avesta*, of all the religious documents of the ancient heathen the one which is most nearly allied to the Old Testament revelation, and most in harmony with it, contains an assertion quite similar to the one before us: "When the body dies here below, it mingles with the earth, but the soul returns to heaven." (*Bundehesch*, p. 384.) Something allied to this is found in some of the Greeks, *e. g.*, *Phokyllides*, *Ποίημα νουθετικόν*, and in *Euripides' Fragments* [but more distinctly in the *Drama of the Suppliants*, 535: *πνεῦμα μὲν πρὸς Αἰθερα (προς Δία) τὸ σῶμα δ' εἰς γῆν*.—T. L.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

(*With Homiletical Hints.*)

This section properly contains the net result of the religious speculation of the Preacher; and in it the positive ground thoughts of the entire book arrive at their fullest development, and most striking and definite expression. This is externally seen in the style, hitherto at times, languid, of prosaic latitude, and anharmonious, but now rising to the loftiest strains, and clothed with the richest figurative adornments. Chap. x. had distinguished itself from the preceding by its greater wealth of figures and ingenious expressions; but now, from the very beginning of chap. xi., figure crowds on figure in a still more remarkable degree, until, in the introductory verses of the 12th chapter, or the third strophe of this section, the figurative ornament of speech rises to a fullness of the most profound, vivid, and surprising comparisons, which here and there almost give the impression of excessive and tumid accumulation. And yet the single figurative expressions need only correct illustration and fitting insertion into the combination of the whole, in order to stand justified against every suspicion of absence of taste or presence of ex-

tercepted,—so also when the silver cord (of life) has parted, the stream of vitality returns back to its fountain, and the man dies."

There must, however, be kept in mind the general parallel with the rich mansion of the voluptuary; and in this aspect the golden bowl is undoubtedly the lamp depending from the ceiling by the silver cord, as is described in the Æneid I. 726.

Dependent lychni laquearibus aureis
Incensi, et noctem flammis funalia vincunt;

and which finally wears out and gives way. So the fountain and the cistern are the costly and curious water-machinery which such a mansion required for domestic drinking, and for irrigation. All is pictured as now in ruin, or going to ruin, like the curious circulating machinery of the human body with which it is compared. In regard to the reading of the text, we cannot do better than to retain the K'tib יֵרָחֵק, and, pointed as it is, in the Niphal. From the sense of *distance* comes easily that of *elongation* (*elongabitur*), and thence of *giving way*, or *parting*. The words מַבּוּעַ and בּוֹר although they differ etymologically, are probably chosen only for the sake of variety.—T. L.]

*[Compare iii. 21, and the marginal note, page 71, on the expression, "who knows the spirit of man that goeth up," *etc.*—T. L.]

*[See the remarks on this passage Ps. xlix. 15—and the בֹּקֶר, "the morning," or *dies retributionis*, in the Introd. to Gen. i., *Bibelwerk*, Genesis, page 142, and marginal note.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

cess, and to bring out into clearer light the object of the picture, *viz.*, the many tribulations of age, the premonitions of approaching death, and finally the very process of life's dissolution itself; all this, too, more vividly than is elsewhere in Holy Writ effected, at least in so restricted a space. It shows an imperfect comprehension of this most interesting and original of all the descriptions in the book, that several commentators, especially UMBREIT and ELSTER, mistake the gradual progress of the described symptoms of dissolution from the commencement of senile feebleness till death, and, by means of an allegorical perversion, force on the details concerning old age as the forerunner of death (vers. 3–5), a direct reference to death itself. The usual conception of these verses, according to which they describe the body of man, together with its organs, as they grow old under the figure of a household sinking into decay and dissolution, is precisely that which justifies the praise ever given to the author as the representative of a wisdom endowed with unusual penetration in the sphere of theological and anthropological research. That characterizing of Koheleth originating with ORIGEN, and adopted by HIERONYMUS, giving to it the signification of a compendium of the physics of Solomon, (just as Proverbs contains the quintessence of his ethics, and the Song, the logic or dialectics of the wise king—comp. the General Introduction to the Solomonic writings) appears very especially justified by this passage; but this can only be the case when it is understood on the basis of the above developed, and only just comprehension of it as a description of the sad autumn and winter of the corporeal life of this world, and therewith as a foundation for the conception of human nature as a manifoldly significant image of the universe in general.

Beneficent, prosperous, industrious, and cheerful labors in life, afford the strongest security for lasting happiness, and to this fundamental thought of the section, the description in question holds the double relation that, on the one hand, it is to present and confirm the preceding admonition to a cheerful enjoyment of the pleasures of life's spring and summer, by reference to the contrast between these and the terrors of the autumn and winter of life, whilst, on the other hand, it is to present the basis for the farther admonition to that continual fear of God, which was necessarily to form the crowning termination and final goal of all the practical precepts of the author.—Comp. EWALD, p. 324: "The numerous tribulations of old age, and the mournful signs of approaching death, are described in the most striking figures, in order the more pressingly to admonish to a cheerful enjoyment of life at the proper period; but, at the same time, there appears most significantly the other truth by which the former receives its full light and correct limits, namely, that this very joy in life must not be blind and thoughtless, but thoughtful and conscious in remembrance of the eternal judgment over all things;—a truth which is indeed to be understood in every stern view of life, and which, therefore, has been only cursorily touched at an earlier period, (iii. 12, 17; viii. 12 ff.), but which is purposely alluded to here, in order to avoid any possible misunderstanding before the final close."—In view of the fearful earnestness of this concluding reference to death and eternity, every suspicion of Epicureanism, or of a frivolous, skeptical, and materialistic disposition, as a background for the preceding counsels to enjoy life, must disappear; and this the more so, since that which precedes this admonition to enjoyment of life testifies clearly enough of the deep seriousness and purity of the author's ethical views. For the admonition at the commencement of the 11th chap. (vers. 1-3) which reminds us of that in Ps. cxii. 9, counseling a profuse benevolence, mindful of no loss and of no gain, appears clearly as a true fruit of faith in a holy, just, and paternally loving God, but which could never spring from an Epicurean, skeptical, or fatalistic view of the world. The subsequent admonition to an unwearied fulfilment of our calling, unmindful of the future yet cautious and conscientious (vers. 4-6), proceeds not from a dull, melancholy resignation, or a loathing despair of life, but simply and alone from a childlike yielding to the will of God, and obedient subjection to His counsels as the only wise. Indeed, even in the reference to the sweetness of light, and the loveliness of life under the sun, with which (in ver. 7) he paves the way to that injunction to cheerful enjoyment, there is nothing in any way Epicurean, or that shows a one-sided, earthly, irreligious disposition. There is rather nothing expressed therein but the deep religious feeling of a pure joy in the beauty of the works of God, and an inwardly thankful appreciation of the proofs therein offered of His boundless goodness; a feeling that forms a contrast quite as opposite to all fatalism and gloomy atheistical materialism, as to every kind of moral levity, or thoughtless desire for enjoyment. See ELSTER, p. 125: "The deep feeling for the beauty and loveliness of life, which Koheleth expresses in this verse, shows us that it was not a bitter discontent based on a dull insensibility of the inward spirit; but his grief lies therein that with this deep feeling for beauty which human existence bears within itself, he painfully encounters, on the one hand, the fact that men are mutually cheating each other out of the real profit of life, whilst, on the other, he perceives that this existence is fleeting and transitory, and that he has foreclosed the hope of a future clearing up of human destiny because the view of a life after death seems to him utterly dark and uncertain (??).—The period which man is permitted to seize in the present, must now appear to him only so much the more important; and the only sure thing remaining to man must seem to him to be the holding fast of eternity by the highest activity in this particular period. Therefore to verse 8 there is again joined the admonition to pleasure, whose nature and character are clearly enough depicted in what precedes, as *free from everything low and common, and rather as depending on the Most High and Eternal One.*"

Add to all this the fact, that the author marks the youthful vivacity and cheerfulness of life, which he recommends, expressly as a disposition to be tempered and purified by the thought of the retributive justice of God (ii. 9) and that there is ever present as the final aim of every earthly-human development (according to chap.

xii. 7), an eternal sojourn of the immortal soul with a holy and just God—a thought which Elster in the passage just quoted is clearly wrong in denying (see the exegetical illustrations to this passage),—adding this, and there results from it most conclusively that character of his ethical wisdom which is in conformity with revelation, and indeed directly belonging to revelation. We see especially the divinely inspired and incomparable nature of the religious truths of this section, in which the devout meditation of the author has reached its highest point, and after vanquishing doubt and hostility, combines its positive results into a chain of the purest ethical maxims, and the most profound physico-theological observations.

Homily on the Entire Section: The fear of God is the foundation of all true virtue, and all lasting joys.—*Or:* The fear of the Lord is the beginning and end of all wisdom.—*Or:* Live so in thy youth that old age brings to thee not terrors, but only the desire of relief from the yoke of this earthly life, and the joyful hope of an eternal existence with God.—*Or:* Use the morning of thy life profitably, that its evening may be calm and blissful; sow good seed in the spring-time of thy life, that thou mayest have a good harvest in the autumn.

HOMILETICAL HINTS ON SEPARATE PASSAGES.

Chap. xi. 1-3. Luther (ver. 1):—Be liberal whilst you can; use wealth in doing all the good in your power; for if you live long you shall receive a hundredfold.—Cartwright:—The universal instability of all things should excite you to munificence, whatever may happen in respect to you or the riches you may possess. Credit it for gain, whatever you may save from the flames and conflagration, as it were, by bestowing it upon the poor.—Starke (ver. 2):—In giving alms we are not to look too closely at the worthiness of the individuals. God permits His sun to rise on the just and the unjust!—Von Gerlach:—Collect not thy treasures by gathering in, but rather by giving out, by a denial of self! Ps. cxii. 9; 2 Cor. ix. 9.

Vers. 4-6. Hieronymus:—In season, out of season, the word of God is to be preached; and so without thought of clouds, or fear of winds, even in the midst of tempests, may we sow (the word). We are not to say this time is convenient, another unsuitable, since we know not what is the way of the Spirit that controls all.

Hansen:—In the distribution of his good deeds a man should not be too timorous; the left hand should not know what the right hand doeth.—Lange (ver. 5):—One cannot know how much good God may effect for the perfection of the faith, even among the dissolute poor!—Starke (ver. 6):—Do not delay thy amendment until an advanced age; begin early to fear God; thou wilt never repent of it. It is, however, better to repent even in age than to continue in one's sins. But he who fears God from youth up, will find his reward so much the more glorious, Rev. ii. 10.—Hengstenberg (ver. 6):—Be incessantly active. In seasons of destitution be so much the more active, because just then many things may miscarry. The more doubtful the result, so much the less should we lay our hands in our lap.

Vers. 7 and 8. Melanchthon:—Whilst God permits, reverently use His gifts; when He takes away, patiently submit; as Paul says, "Let the peace of God dwell in your hearts."—Cramer:—Because man has a desire for natural light, and shuns darkness, he should, therefore, practice the works of light, and shun those of darkness. It is a piece of ingratitude that we think more of our past evil days than of the good ones. We must thank God for both: Job ii. 10.—Hengstenberg:—However great are the sorrows of this life, however manifold its vanities, and sad its circumstances, it is nevertheless true that life is a good, and it is the office of the word of God to impress this truth when gloomy despondencey has gained the ascendency. Disgust of life is also sinful under the New Testament law. A pious spirit will find out the sunny side in this earthly existence, and rejoice in it with heartfelt gratitude.

Vers. 9 and 10. Luther:—When the heart is in a right state no joy will harm, provided only it be true joy, and not merely a corrupting mirth. Enjoy it, then, if there is any thing pleasant for the sight or hearing; provided you sin not against God.—Zeyss:—If thou wilt be preserved against the sadness of the world, thou must carefully guard thyself against its causes, *i. e.*, the ruling sins and vices, and accustom thy heart to the genuine fear of God, Sirach i. 17.—Wolle:—He who would rejoice in the best bloom of his youth, must become acquainted with the Lord Jesus betimes, the fairest among the children of men, and make his heart a temple of the Holy Spirit, Sirach li. 18 ff.—Wohlfarth:—That your youth may gladly enjoy youth, that the tempter may not destroy its roses and cast it into endless woe, have God before your eyes, ye young men and maidens, and remember the serious words: Every one who forgets Him, He will summon to judgment.

Chap. xii. 1-5. Luther:—Holy Writ calls consolation and happiness *light*, and tribulation *darkness*, or *night*. For boys, for youth, for manhood, there is joy. After rain comes the beautiful sunshine, *i. e.*, although at times there may be tribulation, yet joy and consolation follow. But age has no joy; the clouds return after the rain; one misfortune follows another.—Cramer (ver. 1):—Who would be devout must begin betimes; for it is unseemly to offer the dregs of life to God, after having given his blooming youth to the devil.—[Matthew Henry (ver. 5):—Man goes to "his long home." At death he goes from this world and all the employments and enjoyments of it. He has gone *home;* for here he was a stranger and a pilgrim. He has gone to his rest, to the place where he is to fix. He has gone to *the house of his world*, so some would render it; for this world is not his. He is gone to his *house* of eternity (Beth olamo). This should make us willing to die, that at death we *go home;* and why should we not long to go to our Father's house? Ver. 6. Death will dissolve the frame of nature, and take down the earthly house of this tabernacle. Then shall the *silver cord* by which the soul and body were wonderfully fastened together be *loosed*, that sacred knot untied, and those old friends be forced to part. Then shall the golden bowl which held for us the waters of

life *be broken;* then shall the *pitcher* with which we used to fetch up water, for the constant support of life, and the repair of its decays, be broken, even *at the fountain;* so that it can fetch up no more; and *the wheel*, all those organs that serve for the collecting and distributing of nourishment, shall be shattered, and disabled to do their office any more. The body has become like a watch when the spring has broken; the motion of all the wheels is stopped; they all stand still; the machine is taken to pieces; the heart beats no more, nor does the blood circulate.

Ver. 7:—So death resolves us into our first principles. Man is a ray of heaven united to a clod of earth; at death these are separated, and each goes to the place whence it came.—T. L.]

Vers. 6 and 7. LUTHER:—It is not defined where the spirit goes, but only that it returns to God from whom it came. For as we are ignorant of the source whence God made the spirit, so also we know not whither (or to what) it returns. Comp. HENGSTENBERG: The view that the individual soul returns to God, is supported by the fact that it had its origin immediately from God. According to this passage, creationism must be true, although it is a truth which, for certain significant reasons that favor traducianism, can only be regarded as a partial, or one-sided one. It is important that the two apparently opposing views should be reconciled by something common to both.

ZÖCKLER:—Not a few older theologians have endeavored to interpret this passage (xii. 7) in the interest of a one-sided creationism; *e. g.*, HIERONYMUS, who says: "They are to be contemned who hold that souls are sown with bodies, and are born, not from God, but from the bodies of the parents. But since the flesh returns to earth, and the spirit to God who gave it, it is clear that *God, not man*, is the parent of souls. To this the traducianist replies: Koheleth treats, in this verse, solely of the creation of the first man (or the first humanity) * and of his relation to God (and so, at least by intimation, LUTHER on this passage, and CARTWRIGHT in *Hengstenberg*, p. 258); but they are not able thereby to remove the partial creationistic sense of the passage. Compare HENGSTENBERG and VAIHINGER.

WOLLE:—Unblessed is the old age and death of those who grow old in the service of sin. On the contrary, a conscience kept pure from youth up, lightens and sweetens both the toils of age and the bitterness of death, Job xxvii. 6.—BERLEB. BIBLE: — Souls come from eternity into the world as to a stage. There they manifest their persons (their masks) their affections, and their passions, whatever is in them of good or bad. When they have, as it were, sufficiently performed their parts, they again disappear, and lay off the persons that they have represented, and stand, naked as they are, before the divine tribunal. Universal as is the decree that all men are to return to God, there is, nevertheless, a great difference in them. The most return to him as to their offended Lord; but some as to the All-merciful, their friend and father. Because then this coming to God is certain and unavoidable, it should be our most necessary care that we are every moment concerned as to how we may come to Him rightly.—VAIHINGER:—The divine judgment of the life and conduct of men, as mentioned in chap. xi. 9, is only rendered possible by the personal return of the spirit to God. Therefore in youth must we think of our Creator, and live in His fear (iii. 14; v. 7); for the spirit does not become dust with the body; it returns not to the universal force of nature, but because it is from God it returns to God, to be judged by Him, *i. e.*, either to be blessed or condemned.

*[There is a sense in which creationism may be held in respect to the animal, and even the vegetable life. It is not irrational, it is not unscriptural, to suppose that in every true genesis there is a going on of the old unspent creative power, or word acting in a plane above the ordinary mechanical and chemical laws which God has given to nature. In a still higher sense may this be held of the human generation,—of the individual as well as of the first generic man (see Ps. cxxxix. 13–16; Jer. i. 4). And yet such a view is consistent with a doctrine of traducianism that connects every man with the first man, not by an arbitrary *forensic* decree, or appointment from without, but by a vital union, a psychological continuance of the same being, however great the mystery it may involve. There is a school of theologians who say that "*in some way*," by God's appointment, we are so connected with Adam that we sin "in consequence" of his sin, and suffer "in consequence" of his sin, though each succeeding human soul is born separate and pure. There is another school that brands this with heresy, or treats it as evasive, and claims for itself a higher orthodoxy on account of the use of the words "federal headship," "imputation," *etc.*, whilst they equally affirm that Adam's posterity are not *morally guilty* in respect to the first sin. It is a representative, a forensic guilt, though involving the most tremendous consequences. Any essential difference between these is not easily discerned. Both make it a matter of outward and arbitrary institution, as long as there is denied any such psychological and ontological connection between us and the first man as grounds this "federal headship" and "imputation," as well as this "certain consequence as a fact," on a remoter and deeper union. The first class of terms are very precious ones, and sustained by the figures and analogies of Scripture, but their meaning collapses, or becomes arbitrary, when we put nothing beyond them as a fact, however inexplicable that fact may be. Holding to such deeper union, we become, indeed, involved in a *metaphysical* mystery, but we get free from the moral mystery, which is a much more important thing.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

EPILOGUE.

Review of the whole, and Commendatory Recapitulation of the truths therein contained.

CHAP. XII. 8–14.

1. With reference to the personal worth of the author.

(VERS. 8–11).

8 9 Vanity of vanities, saith the Preacher; all *is* vanity. And moreover, because
the Preacher was wise, he still taught the people knowledge: yea, he gave good heed,
10 and sought out, *and* set in order many proverbs. The Preacher sought to find
out acceptable words: and *that which was* written, *was* upright, *even* words of truth.
11 The words of the wise *are* as goads, aud as nails fastened *by* the masters of assem-
blies, *which* are given from one shepherd.

2. With reference to the serious and weighty character of his teachings.

(VERS. 12–14).

12 And further, by these, my son, be admonished: of making many books *there is*
13 no end; and much study *is* a weariness of the flesh. Let us hear the conclusion
of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep his commandments: for this *is* the whole
14 *duty* of man. For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret
thing, whether *it be* good, or whether *it be* evil.

Ver. 9.—אִזֵּן. The primary sense of this root must be the *ear*, or *hearing;* since it is easier to understand how the sense of *weighing* (as it is in the Arabic וזן) came from that, than *vice versa*. The latter sense is either by a very natural figure, or from the resemblance of a balance with its two ears, as they may be called. Its intensive piel sense here may denote listening attentively, as a prelude to judging, or the act of the mind itself.

[Ver. 11.—בַּעֲלֵי אֲסֻפּוֹת would be, according to the common usage, "masters of collections," or of gatherings. בעל, however, sometimes only very slightly modifies the meaning of the following word, and there is nothing in the way of its having the objective sense, like other similar auxiliary words: "objects of collections," rather than "makers of collections,"—the things gathered rather than the gatherers. So HITZIG views it, who has rendered it simply *gesammelten*, that is, *collectanea* or collections. In this way alone does it make a true parallel with the "words of the wise" in the previous number: "their gathered sentences," as we have rendered it in the Metrical Version.—T. L.]

[Ver. 12.—סְפָרִים. See remarks, p. 30.—T. L.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

This concluding discourse opens purposely with that sentence which opened the book (1, 2), namely, with a lamentation over the vanity of all earthly things. This exclamation cannot be considered as a conclusion to what precedes, because the very words that immediately precede (ver. 7) had opened the view to something that is not הֶבֶל, but the vanquishing of all הֲבָלִים, and because, especially in the last section of the fourth discourse, the reference to the vanity of the world, or the negative side of the truths taught by the author, had fallen much behind the positive ideas of zeal in vocation, cheerful joy of life, and fear of God (as not vanities, but as virtue conquering vanity). Unlike the division followed by DE WETTE, KOSTER, ROSENMUELLER, KNOBEL, EWALD, HITZIG, ELSTER, *etc.*, verse 8 is to be connected with what follows, in accordance with most of the older commentators (also with DATHE, UMBREIT, VAIHINGER, HENGSTENBERG, HAHN, *etc.*) and is to be considered as an introductory formula* of the Epilogue, purposely conforming to the beginning of the whole. This view is also strengthened by the circumstance that the ו at the commencement of the

*[The correctness of this would depend entirely upon the view we take of the preceding description. If it is the old age of the sensualist, the "aged sinner," as WATTS calls him, and as we have maintained in the note preceding the exegetical remarks on the section,—then this exclamation: Oh, vanity! all vanity! would be a very appropriate close. At the beginning of this scholium it would seem out of place under any circumstances, except, perhaps, as an imitation of the beginning of the book, for which there can be assigned no reason in any connection it has with what follows, whether regarded as all appended by a scholiast, or, which is the most probable view, that vers. 9, 10 are an inserted *prose* note by some other hand, intended to call special attention to the weighty concluding words that follow from the original author. These are clearly poetry, and as rhythmical as any

Digitized by Google

ninth verse presents this, not as an introductory verse, but as the continuation of something already begun, whilst on the contrary the expression הֲבֵל הֲבָלִים, ver. 8, according to the analogy of chap. i. 2, is clearly used as an introductory formula. The object of this formula at the opening of the epilogue is again to present to the reader the negative summation of the observations and experience of the author, the fact of the vanity and perishability of all earthly things in order subsequently to establish the correctness of this result by a double testimony:—1. By vindication of the moral weight of the personality of the author as a genuinely wise man and teacher of wisdom (vers. 9-11); 2. by referring to the very serious and important character of the precepts laid down by him (vers. 12-14). These two divisions are characterized by equal length and analogous construction* (*i. e.*, that they both begin with וְיֹתֵר "and moreover") as skilfully planned strophes or executions of the theme contained in ver. 8, and not as two mere postscripts of the author added as by chance (HITZIG); whilst in the latter the positive result of the religious and moral observations of the Preacher appears again in the most significant and precise form possible (ver. 13), strengthened, too, by an addition (ver. 14) which presents most clearly the correct intermediation of the positive with the negative result in ver. 8, and thus affords the only true solution of the great enigma from which chap. i. 2 had proceeded. This solution consists simply in pointing him who is discontented and anxious about the vanity and unhappiness of this life, to the great day of universal reckoning, and in the inculcation of the duty of deferential obedience to a holy and just God,—a duty from which no one can escape with impunity. As this epilogue is in reality the first to offer the key to the correct understanding of the whole, (for the sum of the previously developed precepts of wisdom, is given neither so clearly nor impressively in chap. xi. 1-12, 7, as is the case here) we clearly perceive the untenability of that hypercritical view (V. D. PALM, DÖDERLEIN, BERTHOLD, KNOBEL, UMBREIT, and, to a certain extent, also, of HERZFELD) which denies the authenticity of these closing verses (from ver. 9). For a special refutation of their arguments comp. the Int. § 8, Obs.

2. *First strophe.* Vers. 8–11. The negative result of the book, attested in its truth and importance by reference to the personal worth of the author as a genuine teacher of wisdom. For verse 8 see partly the previous paragraph (No. 1), and partly the exegetical illustrations to chaps. 1 and 2. For the name קֹהֶלֶת (here without the article) see the Intr., § 1. Ver. 9. **And moreover because the Preacher was wise.** וְיֹתֵר (used substantively): "and the remainder" (comp. 1 Sam. xv. 15), is here, and in verse 12, clearly equivalent to: "and there remains," namely, "to say." The indirect construction follows here, introduced by שֶׁ (comp. the Lat. *restat, ut, etc.*), whilst in ver. 12 we find the direct construction (comp. the Lat. *Quod restat*, or *Ceterum*). GESENIUS, WINER, KNOBEL, VAIHINGER, *etc.*, translate וְיֹתֵר שֶׁהָיָה "and moreover, because," and therefore accept this clause as preliminary, letting the subsequent one commence with עוֹד (LUTHER does the same: "This same Preacher was not only wise," *etc.*; and so, in sense, the Vulgate: "*Cumque esset sapientissimus Ecclesiastes*"). But this is opposed partly by the analogy of the commencement, v. 12, and partly by the circumstance that the עוֹד alone could scarcely introduce the secondary clause. HENGST. correctly remarks concerning חָכָם: "A wise man, not in the sense of the world, but of the kingdom of God, not from one's self, but from God (comp. ver. 11), so that this passage is not in contradiction with Prov. xxvii. 2: 'Let another man praise thee, and not thine own mouth; a stranger, and not thine own lips.' And nevertheless, Solomon could hardly have spoken thus of himself without incurring the censure of self-praise. And even another, who had written this with reference to him, would, in reality, have expressed something insipid and inappropriate, in case he really had the historic Solomon in his eye. For which reason the fictitious character of Koheleth, or his merely ideal identity with Solomon is quite apparent.—**He still taught the people knowledge.**—For עוֹד at the beginning of a sentence, comp. Gen. xix. 12; Micah vi. 10; Job xxiv. 20.—**Yea, he gave good heed, and sought out, and set in order many proverbs.**—אִזֵּן "to consider, to weigh," the root of מֹאזְנַיִם "balances." This verb in conjunction with the following וְחִקֵּר shows the means whereby he "set in order" (תִּקֵּן comp. chap. i. 15; vii. 13), many proverbs. This product was the result of careful investigation and reflection—a relation of the three verbs to one another, which is clearly indicated by the absence of the copula before the third: תִּקֵּן; comp. Gen. xlviii. 14; 1 Kings xiii. 18; EWALD, § 333 *c.*—By the "many proverbs" (הַרְבֵּה as in v. 7; xi. 8), the author evidently does not mean those mentioned in 1 Kings v. 12, but rather those sayings of Solomon that are contained in the Book of Proverbs; for he imitates mainly these latter in his own contained in this book.—Ver. 10. **The Preacher sought to find out acceptable words.**—דִּבְרֵי־חֵפֶץ, pleasant, agreeable words (λόγον χαριτος, Luke iv. 23), comp. אַבְנֵי חֵפֶץ Isa. liv. 12. Here are naturally meant

thing in the book. Such inserted scholia should create no more difficulty than their evident appearance in Genesis, and elsewhere in the Pentateuch. The remark that follows, about the force of the conjunction ו has no weight whatever. It is so often used as a mere transition particle; and the idea of any logical, or even rhetorical, connection between the exclamation and the plain prosaic annotation that follows is absurd.—T. L.]

*[It should be said, rather, that the two divisions are made by the 9 and 10, on the one hand, and all that follows on the other. The fact that ver. 12 begins with וְיֹתֵר is of no importance in this respect. But that which has a decided bearing on the division is overlooked, namely, that the first (9 and 10) is the plainest prose, whilst the second (beginning with the 11th) most clearly returns to the poetical both in thought and diction,—a fact which shows that the first belongs to a scholiast, the second to the main and original author of the book. See the Metrical Version.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

words acceptable not to the great mass, but to serious minds, heavenly inclined, and seeking wisdom; words of honeyed sweetness in the sense of Ps. xix. 11, *verba quæ, jure meritoque desiderari et placere debent, tamquam divinæ virtutis et certitudinis* (S. SCHMIDT). The expression חֵפֶץ can scarcely relate to mere acceptability and adornment of the form of speech (as asserted by HITZIG and ELSTER).—**And that which was written was upright, even words of truth.** The passive participle וְכָתוּב expresses that which was written by the author in consequence of seeking after acceptable words; hence HERZFELD, and after him, HENGSTENBERG and ELSTER, are correct: "*and* thus then was written what was correct;" EWALD and VAIHINGER, on the contrary, render erroneously: "*but* honest words were written," which adversative rendering of the conjunction is decidedly injurious to the sense and opposed to the text. HITZIG reads וְכָתוֹב the infinitive absolute: "to find (לִמְצֹא) and *write*;" but this change is quite as unnecessary as the adverbial rendering of יֹשֶׁר in the sense of "correct, honest," which latter rendering is also found in LUTHER, KNOBEL, VAIHINGER, ELSTER, *etc.* It is מֵישָׁרִים that expresses this adverbial sense every where else (Song of Solomon i. 4; vii. 10; Prov. xxiii. 31; Ps. lviii. 1). יֹשֶׁר is, on the contrary, here, as every where, a substantive, meaning straightforwardness, uprightness; and that in which this uprightness consists is expressed by the words in apposition, דִּבְרֵי אֱמֶת—"words of truth," *i. e.*, in true teaching, acceptable to God, and therefore bringing blessings; teachings of the genuine "heavenly wisdom." Comp. Prov. viii. 6–10; James iii. 17.—Ver. 11. **The words of the wise are as goads.**—The author, by bringing "the words of truth" under the general category of "words of the wise" (*i. e.*, of those ethical precepts as they issue from the circles of the Chakamim, to which he himself belongs according to ver. 9), lends to them so much the more weighty significance and authority; for all that can be said in praise of the words of the Chakamim in general must now especially avail also of his proverbs and discourses. Hence the phrase דִּבְרֵי חֲכָמִים would be more fittingly rendered by: "Such words of wise men" (comp. HITZIG). HENGSTENBERG takes too narrow, or, if we will, too broad a view of the idea of "wise men," when he, in connection with older authors, as LUTHER, RAMBACH, STARKE, *etc.*, sees therein only the inspired writers of the O. T., or the authors of the Canonical Books; according to which this verse would contain a literal and direct self-canonization. But this is opposed by the fact that חכמים elsewhere always means the authors of the characteristic Proverbial wisdom, or Chokmah, the teachings of the Solomonic and post-Solomonic era, which is to be clearly distinguished from the prophetic and lyrico-poetical [Psalmistic] literature (see 1 Kings iv. 30 f.; Prov. i. 6; xxii. 17; Jer. xviii. 18; and comp. §3 of the *General Intr.* to the Solomonic literature, Vol. XII., p. 8 f.), so that Moses, Joshua, Samuel, David, *etc.*, could not possibly have been reckoned in this category. This is quite apart from the fact that such a self-canonization expressed in the manner aforesaid, would have been neither especially appropriate nor sufficiently clear. כַּדָּרְבֹנוֹת, "like goads," *i. e.*, endowed with stinging, correctly aiming, and deeply penetrating effect, "*verba, quæ aculeorum instar alte descendunt in pectora hominum, iisque manent infixa*" (GESENIUS; comp. EWALD, HITZIG, HENGSTENBERG and ELSTER). It is usually regarded as "ox-goads" (Septuagint, ὡς τὰ βούκεντρα; Targ., Talm., Rabb., and most of the moderns). But דָּרְבוֹן or דָּרְבָן (1 Sam. xiii. 21), neither means specially, according to its etymology, a goad to drive cattle, nor does the parallel "as nails" lead exactly to this special meaning, to which the plural form of the expression would not be favorable. Neither is it the case that all the words of the wise, nor especially all the proverbs of this book, are of a goading, that is, an exhortatory, nature, as HITZIG very correctly observes. Therefore we must stop at the simple meaning of "goads," and interpret this to signify the penetrating brevity, the inciting and searching influence of these precepts of wisdom of Koheleth and other wise men.—**And as nails fastened by the masters of assemblies.**—As the "fastened nails" doubtless form a synonym to the "goads," so the masters of assemblies, literally "the colleagues of the assembly" [בַּעֲלֵי אֲסֻפּוֹת comp. chap. x. 11, 20; Prov. i. 17; Isa. xli. 15] can only be another expression for those "words of the wise." We are therein to understand collected maxims of wisdom, united into one assembly or collection, and not merely well connected proverbs, as EWALD and ELSTER would have it; for the verb אסף does not refer to the excellence and perfection of the collection; neither does the figure of the nails, which, at most, leads to the idea of juncture, and not to that of a specially beautiful and harmonious order. Highly unfitting also is the interpretation of בַּעֲלֵי אֲסֻפּוֹת as "masters of assemblies" (LUTHER), *i. e.*, partakers in learned assemblies [GESENIUS] or principals of learned schools, teachers of wisdom [VAIHINGER, *etc.*], or even authors of the individual books of the sacred national library, or authors of the separate books of the Old Testament Canon [HENGSTENBERG]. This personal signification of the expression is forbidden once for all by the parallelism with the "words of wisdom" in the first clause.—**Which are given from one shepherd.**—That is, in so far as the "words of the wise" in the preceding book are united, they proceed from one author, who was not only a wise man, but a "shepherd" in the bargain, *i. e.*, a wise teacher, the leader of a congregation, an elder of the synagogue. For this sense of "shepherd" as chief of a school, or a priestly teacher, comp. Jer. ii. 8; iii. 15; x. 21; xxiii. 4. The oneness of the authorship is here thus pointedly expressed by way of contrast to the many "wise men" in the first clause. To refer the expression to God [HIERON., GEIER, MICHAELIS, STARKE, HENGSTENBERG, HERZFELD, KNOBEL,

Digitized by Google

etc.], is quite as arbitrary as a reference to Moses [Targ.], to the historic Solomon [JABLONSKI, *etc.*], to Zerubbabel [GROTIUS], or as the emendation מִרְעֶה for מֵרֹעֶה by virtue of which HITZIG translates: "which are given united as a pasture" [reading נִתְּנוּ instead of נִתְּנוּ]

8. *Second strophe.* Ver. 12–14. The positive result of the book as a self-speaking testimony for the truth, worth, and weight of its contents.—**And further, by these, my son, be admonished.**—The word מֵהֵמָּה is closely but improperly connected by the Masoretic accentuation with וְיֹתֵר (it can as well be absolute as in ver. 9 above): it refers to the "words of the wise given by one shepherd," contained in ver. 11, and thus, in short, to the maxims of this book [not of the entire Old Testament Canon, as HENGSTENBERG thinks]. "From them" [comp. Gen. ix. 11; Isa. xxviii. 7], the reader, the "son" of the wise teacher, is to be admonished. For בְּנִי "my son," which is equivalent to my scholar; compare Prov. i. 8; x. 15; ii. 1, *etc.*, and for הִזָּהֵר "be admonished," "accept wisdom," chap iv. 13, preceding.—**Of making many books there is no end.**—That is, beware of the unfruitful, even dangerous, wisdom which others [partly in Israel, partly among the heathen, *e. g.*, Egyptians, Persians, Greeks, *etc.*—Comp. Intr., § 3, Obs.] endeavor to spread and inculcate in numberless writings.* It is not worldly literature, in general, in contrast to the spiritual literature of Divinely inspired writings, against which the author utters a warning (HENGSTENBERG), but the useless and deceitful literature of others which he contrasts with that genuine wisdom taught by him. The countless elaborations of false philosophers [Col. ii. 8], as they already then in the bloom of Hellenistic sophistry were beginning to fill the world, are presented to his readers by way of warning, as a foul and turbid flood of perverted and ruinous opinions, by which they ought not to permit themselves to be carried away. HERZFELD takes the infinitive עֲשׂוֹת as a genitive dependent on אֵין קֵץ, and renders אֵין in a conditional sense, "to making many books there would be no end." HITZIG opposes this rendering, but improperly takes אֵין קֵץ as a mere adverbial modifier to הַרְבֵּה instead of the מְאֹד elsewhere customary in such connection, and hence translates "the making of *very* many books," requiring much exertion of the mind (לַהַג) "is weariness of the body." Thereby Koheleth would give his readers to understand that he might have written for them whole books filled with maxims of wisdom (comp. John xxi. 25), but would rather not do this, as being useless and fatiguing. But the term "infinitely many" would then involve a very strong hyperbole; and the equality and rhythmical harmony of the construction would be too much destroyed by such an affirmation of two subjects for the predicate יְגִעַת בָּשָׂר.—**And much study;** Namely, the study of many books, much reading (ABEN EZRA, EWALD, VAIHINGER, ELSTER, *etc.*) not the writing of books (HITZIG), nor the thirst after knowledge (HENGSTENBERG), nor preaching (LUTHER, HAHN, *etc.*),—these are all renderings at variance with the simple and clear sense of לַהַג הַרְבֵּה.—**Is a weariness of the flesh.**—VAIHINGER correctly says, "the passion for reading, which weakens mind and body, whilst fruitful reflection strengthens both. Such a morbid desire corresponds entirely with the later Jewish eras.* See above, chap. i. 18.—Ver. 13. **Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter:** In contrast, that is, to this useless making of many books and much reading. סוֹף, "the end" (comp. iii. 11; vii. 2) does not literally signify the sum of all that has been previously said, but the limit which the author wishes just now to set to his discourse, the practical conclusion by which we are to abide. Therein we see that it is not the total and all-comprehending result of his observations and teachings, but only the positive or practical side of this result (in contrast to the negative one expressed in ver. 8) that he will now express in the following maxim; see above No. 1.—דָּבָר points, even without an article, to the precise discourse of this book, and therefore to the entirety of דִּבְרֵי קֹהֶלֶת (comp. i. 1, and for דָּבָר in this collective sense, see 1 Sam. iii. 17; Joshua xxi. 43, *etc.*) הַכֹּל is really in apposition with דָּבָר, consequently, when strictly taken is to be translated, "the end of the discourse,—of the whole," and not, "the end of the whole discourse." And therewith it is indeed intimated that in the end of the discourse the whole is included, or that the final thought is the ground thought (or at least *one* principal thought); comp. HENGSTENBERG and VAIHINGER. Observe also that by the mutual נִשְׁמָע "let us hear," the author subjects himself to the absolute commandment of fearing God and obeying Him.—**Fear God, and keep His commandments.** Literally, "God fear"—the object of fear emphatically placed before, as in Chap. v. 7.—**For this is the whole duty of man.** There is an ellipsis of the verb in the original, for which comp. chap. ii. 12; Jer. xxiii. 5; xxvi. 9. The correctness of our rendering, which is the same as Luther's ("for that belongs to all men") is confirmed by verse 14, where we are informed of a divine judgment of all men regard-

*[See the remarks in Appendix to Introduction, p. 30, on סְפָרִים as referring here to this very book of Koheleth itself.—the plural either denoting chapters, or *parts* of one treatise, as the term is used by Greek and Latin writers, or being equivalent to *πολλὰ γράμματα*, or *multæ literæ*, "much writing." It may be rendered, therefore, collectively, or in the singular: "in making a great book there is no end." It is an endless, a useless, labor. What is already written is enough; "therefore let us hear," *etc.*—T. L.]

*[There is no maintaining this unless the date of Koheleth is brought down to a period nearly, if not quite, cotemporaneous with the Christian era. Even then, there was no such establishment of Jewish schools, or spread of Jewish books, as would render credible the existence among them of such a *Lesewuth*, or *Lesesucht* ("passion for reading," "morbid desire for reading") as is here spoken of by ZÖCKLER and HITZIG. Such an idea is not hinted at in the New Testament. All this shows the difficulty of finding any place for this book of Koheleth between the time of Solomon and that of Christ. The application of such a remark to the times of Malachi would be utterly absurd.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

ing their works. The *Vulgate*, EWALD, HERZFELD, and ELSTER say, "for that is the whole man," which is as much as saying, "thereon rests his entire fate." But this sense would be very obscurely expressed; and כָּל־הָאָדָם, moreover, never means "the whole man," but "every man," "all men.* Ver. 14.—**For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing.** (ZÖCKLER renders: "Judgment upon every hidden thing"). This direct connection of עַל כָּל־נֶעְלָם with the preceding בְּמִשְׁפָּט is sustained by the construction of the verb שָׁפַט in Niphal with עַל, Jer. ii. 35, as well as by the frequent use of עַל in the sense of "on account," "concerning." The view of HITZIG that עַל here stands for לְ, the particle of relation, is too artificial, as is that of VAIHINGER and HAHN, that עַל=עִם "together with every secret thing." The natural meaning is, the judgment in the next world, as also in ch. xi. 9, not simply that which is executed in the ordinary development of this world. This view is supported also by the addition, "every secret thing," compared with Rom. ii. 16; 1 Cor. iv. 5, as well as by the subsequent, "whether it be good, or whether it be evil," compared with 2 Cor. v. 10; John v. 29, *etc.* Still the present judgment, executed in the history of the world, may come into consideration, here as well as in chap. xi. 9, and Psalm xc. 8. (Comp. John iii. 17 ff.; Eph. v. 13, *etc.*).

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

(*With Homiletical Hints*).

The ground thought of this closing section, as already developed in No. 1 of the exegetical illustrations, is about as follows: The speech of the truly wise man infallibly proves itself to be such by its inner strength and truth; its effect, penetrating, like goads and nails, deeply into the heart, sharpening the dull conscience, mightily summoning the whole man to the fear of God and obedience to His sacred commandments, testifies in the most direct manner to its harmony with the word of God,—yes, even to its divine origin and character. It is the voice of eternity in time, of the imperishable, ever-living truth, rescuing us from sin and death in the midst of the vanity of this world. Thus is it to be understood when the preacher of the genuine truth proclaims to his hearers these two great truths of revelation: "All is vanity," and, "Fear God and keep His commandments," and thus it guides them to a correct knowledge of sin as well as of the way of salvation,—of the law as of the gospel.

In accordance with this, the theme for a succinct homiletical treatment of the section, would be about the following: Of the inward power and truth of the divine word, as is shown in the preaching of the law and gospel (of repentance and faith) as the immutably connected, and fundamental elements of divine revelation.—Or, the knowledge of the vanity of all earthly things as the foundation for the knowledge and inheritance of heavenly glory.—Or: Of the wholesomeness of the wounds inflicted by the goads of the divine word.

*[כָּל, in the *construct.* state, rather means, "the whole of man." The other expression, "every man," might have the *construct.* form, but כֹּל, the absolute, with or without the article, would be the best adapted to it.—T. L.]

HOMILETICAL HINTS TO SEPARATE PASSAGES.

Vers. 9 and 10. CRAMER:—It is not enough that a teacher be simply learned unto himself; it is his duty to serve others with the talent that God has given him, and not to bury it.—STARKE:—He alone is skilful in leading others into the way of truth who himself has been a pupil of truth, who has been instructed in the school of Jesus. GEIER (ver. 10):—Every one who speaks or writes should endeavor with all zeal to present nothing but what is just, true, lovely, and edifying, Phil. iv. 8; 1 Peter iv. 11.

Vers. 11 and 12. BRENZ:—Unless you lay the foundation of faith in the word of God, you will be the sport of every wind; much reading, frequent hearing of discourses, will bring more of error, disquietude, and perturbation, than of genuine fruit.—LUTHER:—He exhorts us not to be led away by various and strange teachings It is as if he had said: You have an excellent teacher; beware of new teachers; for the words of this teacher are goads and spears. Such also were David's and the prophets'. But the bungler's words are like foam on the water.—GEIER:—In sermons and other edifying discourses, we must not speak words of human wisdom, or fables and idle prattle, but the words of the holy men of God, which are, themselves, the words of the living God; godly preaching is proof of the spirit and the power, 1 Cor. ii. 4.—HENGSTENBERG:—We have here a rule for the demeanor of hearers towards the sermon; they are not to be annoyed if its goad penetrates them.

Vers. 13 and 14. MELANCHTHON:—He sets forth a final rule which ought to be the guide of all counsels and actions: Look to God and His teaching; depart not from it, and be assured that he who thus departs rushes, without doubt, into darkness, into the snares of the devil, and into the direst punishments. Refer all counsels and all actions to this end, namely, obedience to God. STARKE:—A sure sign of genuine fear of God, is to be zealous in keeping the commandments of God by the grace of the Holy Ghost.—SIBEL:—Since God has given to us the spirit, let us keep pure and sound this noble deposit, that we may thus return it to the Giver and the Creator. So good and faithful men are wont to guard a deposit committed to their care (1 Tim. vi. 20). On the health of the soul depends the health of the body, and of the whole man. The soul saved we lose nothing; when that is lost all perishes. ZEYSS:—The thought of the day of judgment, is a salutary medicine against false security (Sirach vii. 40), and a sweet promise of the rewards of mercy in eternal life. WOLLE:—Because God is infinitely just, He will neither let hidden evil be unpunished, nor hidden good be unrewarded. To Him therefore be all the glory forevermore.

AMEN.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

METRICAL VERSION OF KOHELETH.

BY THE AMERICAN EDITOR.

INTRODUCTION.

POETICAL CHARACTER OF THE BOOK.

[STUART asserts that Koheleth is not poetry. HITZIG treats it very much in the same way, as essentially a formal prose ethical treatise. It is not too much to say that this overlooking the true poetical character and spirit of the composition, is, with both these commentators, the cause of much frigid exegesis, and false rhetorical division. There is, however, high authority for the other view [see LOWTH's *Heb. Poetry*, p. 205, 411, *Eichhorn Einleitung*, Vol. V., 250, 228, and JAHN's *Introduction to the Old Testament*]. EWALD is decided for its poetical character, and ably maintains it. "A genuine poetic inspiration," he says, "breathes through it all" [see ZÖCKLER's *Introduction*, § 2, Remark 3, p. 10]. He, however, regards some parts as prose (such as the little episode ix. 13-16), or as mere historical narrative, which seem to present the poetic aspect, both in the thought and in the measured diction. Thus the allusion to the "poor wise man who saved the city" is as rhythmical in its parallelism (when closely examined) as any other parts, whilst it is not only illustrative of what is in immediate proximity, but is also itself of the poetic cast in the manner of its conception. Although ZÖCKLER thus refers to EWALD, his own interpretation seems affected too much by the prosaic idea of a formal didactic treatise, with its regular logical divisions. We have deemed this question entitled to a fuller argument here, because it seems so intimately connected with a right view of the book, both as a whole and in the explanation of its parts. The whole matter, however, lies open to every intelligent reader. The question is to be decided by the outward form as it appears in the original, and by the peculiar internal arrangement of the thought in its parallelistic relations. This latter is the special outward mark of Hebrew poetry. Though there may not be anything like iambics or dactyls discoverable, even in the Hebrew, yet every reader of the common English Version feels, at once, that he is coming into a new style of diction, as well as of thought and emotion, when, in Gen. iv. 23 he finds the plain flow of narrative suddenly changed by a new, and evidently measured, arrangement, calling attention to a peculiar subjective state in the writer or utterer, and putting the reader immediately *en rapport* with it:

> Adah and Zillah, hear my voice;
> Ye wives of Lamech, listen to my speech.

So is it also when he finds the inartificial, yet highly eloquent prose narrative of Exodus xiv., and chapters preceding, all at once interrupted by a strain commencing thus—

> I will sing unto Jahveh, for glory! glorious!
> Horse and his rider hath He thrown into the sea;

or when, after the plainest historical style in Numbers xxiv., and previously, he is startled by such music of thought and language as this—

> I shall see Him, but not now;
> I shall behold Him, but not nigh;
> There shall come a star out of Jacob;
> A sceptre shall arise out of Israel.

This is not so striking in Koheleth; in some places it is barely discoverable; but such parallelism of thought and diction is really there, to a greater or less extent, and, in many parts, as clearly discernible as in Job or the Psalms; more clearly than in much of Isaiah. Thus, for example, chap. x. 20—

> Not even in thy thought revile the king;
> Nor in thy chamber dare to curse the rich;
> The birds of heaven shall carry forth the sound;
> The swift of wing, the secret word reveal.

We may even say that it exists throughout, with a few exceptions, perhaps, that may be regarded as introductory or transition sentences, such as brief descriptions of the writer's outward state (i. 12, 13, as also i. 16) and the frequent formulas: "I said in my heart,"—"then I turned again to behold," *etc.* But after each of these, the strain goes on as before. It is musing, meditative, measured thought, in a peculiarly arranged diction, sometimes presenting much regularity in its rhythmical movement, as in chaps. i., xi. and xii., and sometimes seeming so far to lose it that it is known to be poetry only by the inward marks,—that is, the musing cast of thought, and that soul-filling, yet sober emotion which calls up the remoter and more hidden associations, to the neglect of logical or even rhetorical transitions. It is this latter feature that gives to Koheleth an appearance which its name, according to its true etymology, seems to imply—namely, of a *collection* of thoughts as they have been noted down, from time to time, in the memory or common-place book of a thoughtful man, not aiming to be logical, because he himself knows the delicate links that bind together his ideas and emotions without express grammatical formulas, and which the reader, too, will feel and understand, when he is brought into a similar spiritual state. Such a spiritual transition is aided by the rhythmical form, however slight, producing the feeling that it is truly poetry he is reading, and not outwardly logical statements of dogmatic truth,—in short, that these gnomic utterances are primarily the emotional relief of a meditative soul, rather than abstract ethical precepts, having mainly a scientific or intellectual aspect.

In this thought there seems to be found that essential distinction between poetry and prose, which goes below all outward form, whether of style or diction, or which, instead of being arbitrarily dependent on form, makes its form, that is, demands a peculiar dress as its most appropriate, we may even say, its most natural expression. In other words, poetry is ever subjective. It is the soul soliloquizing,—talking to itself, putting in form, for itself, its own thoughts and emotions. Or we might rather say that *primarily* this is so; because, in a secondary sense, it may still be said to be objective and didactic in its ultimate aim, whilst taking on the other, or subjective, form, as least indicative of a disturbing outward consciousness, and, therefore, its most truly effective mode of expression even for outward uses. That this, however, may be the more strongly felt on the part of the reader, his mind, as has been already said, must be *en rapport* with that of the writer, that is, it must get into the same spiritual state, by whatever means, outward or inward, suggestive or even artificial, this may be effected. Poetry is the language of emotion; and it is true of all poetry, even of the soberest and most didactic kind. This emotion may be aroused by the contemplation of great deeds, as in the Heroic poetry, whether of the epic or dramatic kind, or of striking natural objects, as in the descriptive, or of *great thoughts* contemplated as they arise in the mind, with more of the wonderful or emotional than of the logical or scientific interest. This is philosophical poetry,—the thinker devoutly musing, instead of putting forth theses, or aiming primarily to instruct. The utterance is from the fullness of the spirit, and, in this way, has more of didactic or preceptive power than though such had been the direct objective purpose. We have a picture of such a mind, in such a state, in this philosophical poem of Koheleth, with just enough of rhythmical parallelism to awaken

Digitized by Google

the emotional interest. It is this representation of a bewildered, questioning, struggling soul, perplexed with doubt, still holding fast to certain great fundamental truths regarded rather as intuitions than as theorems capable of demonstration, which makes its great ethical value. This value, however, is found in it chiefly as a whole. It consists in the total impression; and we shall be disappointed, often, if we seek it in the separate thoughts, some of which are exceedingly skeptical, whilst others we may not hesitate to pronounce erroneous. It is this subjective picture which the higher, or the divine, author has caused to be made, preserved, and transmitted to us, for our instruction (*πρὸς διδασκαλίαν—προς παιδείαν*, see 2 Tim. iii. 16), so that along with some things fundamental, immutable, which the thoughtful soul can never part with, we may also learn how great the darkness that hangs over the problem of the human and the mundane destiny when illuminated by nothing higher than science and philosophy, either ancient or modern. We need not hesitate to say, that so far as these are concerned, the teaching of the book is as important for the 19th century as it was in the days of Koheleth, whoever he may have been, or at whatever early time he may have lived. STUART thinks differently. Remarking on the affirmations respecting the vanity of what is called "wisdom and knowledge," he says: "Put such a man as Koheleth, at the present time, in the position of a Laplace, Liebig, Cuvier, Owen, Linnæus, Day, Hamilton, Humboldt, and multitudes of other men in Europe and in America, and he would find enough in the pursuit of *wisdom and knowledge*, to fill his soul with the deepest interest, and to afford high gratification." "But it does not follow [he adds] that Koheleth felt wrongly, or wrote erroneously, *at his time*, in respect to these matters. Literary and scientific pursuits, such as are now common among us, were in his day, beyond the reach, and beyond the knowledge of all then living; and how could he reason *then* in reference to what these pursuits *now* are?" (STUART, *Com. on Ecclesiastes*, p. 141). Now Koheleth admits that knowledge, whatever its extent, even mere human knowledge, is better than folly; it is better than sensual Epicureanism; even the sorrows of the one are better than the joys of the other, more to be desired by a soul in a right state; and yet, not in view of any *small amount*, but of the widest possible extent, does he say that "he who increases knowledge" (knowledge of mere earthly things, knowledge of *links* instead of *ends*, knowledge of man's doings, merely, instead of God's ways) only "increases sorrow." The wonder is, that there is not more commonly felt, what is sometimes admitted by the most thoughtful men of science, that the more there is discovered in this field the more mystery there is seen to be, the more light the more darkness following immediately in its train and increasing in a still faster ratio,—in short, the more knowledge we get of nature, and of man as a purely physical being, the greater the doubt, perplexity, and despair, in respect to his destiny, unless a higher light than the natural and the historical is given for our relief. In this respect the modern physical knowledge, or claim to knowledge, has no advantage over the ancient, which it so much despises, but which, in its day, and with its small stock of physical experience, was equally pretentious. Read how LUCRETIUS exults in describing the atomic causality, and the wonderful discoveries that were to banish darkness from the earth, and put an end to that dreaded *Religio*—

Quæ caput a cœli regionibus ostendebat,
Horribili super adspectu mortalibus instans.

How greatly does it resemble some of the boasting of our 19th century, and yet how does our modern science, with its most splendid achievements (which there is no disposition to underrate) stand speechless and confounded in the presence of the real questions raised by the perplexed and wondering Koheleth! What single ray of light has it shed on any of those great problems of destiny which are ever present to the anxious, thoughtful soul! "Our science and our literature!" How is their babble hushed in the presence of the grave! How wretchedly do they stammer when asked to explain that which it concerns us most to know, and without which all other knowledge presents only "a lurid plain of desolation," a "darkness visible," or to use the language of one much older than MILTON, "where the very light is as darkness!" How dumb are these boasting oracles, when, with a yearning anxiety that no knowledge of "the seen and temporal" can appease, we consult them in respect to "the unseen and eternal!" They claim to tell us, or boldly assert that the time is rapidly coming when they will be able to tell us, all

Digitized by Google

that is needed for the perfectibility of human life. But ask them now, what is life, and why we live, and why we die? No answer comes from these vaunting shrines. They have no reply to the most momentous questions: Whence came we? Whither go we? Who are we? What is our place in the scale of being? What is our moral state, our spiritual character? Is there any such thing as an immutable morality? Is there a true ethical rising at all above the physical, or anything more than the knowledge and prudent avoidance of physical consequences? Is there any hope or meaning in prayer? Is there a holy law above us to which our highest ideas of righteousness and purity have never risen? Is there an awful judgment before us? Are we probationers of a moral state having its peril proportioned to an inconceivable height of blessedness only to be attained through such a risk? Is there, indeed, a great spiritual evil within us, and a mighty evil One without us against whom we have to contend? Is there a great perdition, a great Saviour, a great salvation? Is man truly an eternal and supernatural being, with eternal responsibilities, instead of a mere connecting link, a passing step, in a never completed cycle of random "natural selections," or idealess developments, having in them nothing that can truly be called higher or lower, because there is no spiritual standard above the physical, by which their rank and value can be determined?

Such questions are suggested by the reading of Koheleth, although not thus broadly and formally stated. In his oft-repeated cry that "all *beneath the sun* is vanity," there is, throughout, a pointing to something *above the sun*, above nature, above the flowing world of time, to that "work of God" which he says (iii. 14) is לְעוֹלָם, "*for the eternal*," immovable, without flow, without progress, perfect, finished,—"to which nothing can be added, and from which nothing can be taken,"—that high "ideal world," that unmoving Olam, where "all things stand,"—that spiritual supernatural paradigm for the manifestation of which in time, nature with all its flowing types and paradigms was originally made, and to which it is subservient during every *moment*, as well as every *age*, of its long continuance. All here, when viewed in itself, was vanity, but מֵעַל הַשָּׁמֶשׁ, *supra solem*, above the sun, there stood the real. He was sure of the fact, though he felt himself utterly unable to solve the questions connected with it. This makes the impressiveness of his close, when, after all his "*turnings to see*," and his "*thinkings to himself*," or "talkings to his heart," he concludes, as Job and the Psalmist had done, that the "fear of God is the beginning of wisdom," and the keeping of His commandments "the whole of man" (כל האדם), his great "*end*," his constant duty, his only hope of obtaining that higher spiritual knowledge which alone can satisfy the soul (John vii. 17). This he fortifies by the assurance that all shall at last be clear: "For God will bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil."

It is this continual pointing to the "unseen and eternal" [לעולם] that constitutes the peculiar poetical character of the book, so far as the thought is concerned. And then there is the subjective style: "I thought to myself"—"I said to my heart"—"I *turned again* to see"—"I went about, I and my heart;" this, together with the measured diction into which it naturally flows, forms the more outward poetical dress. There are in Koheleth the germs of ideas that extend beyond the utmost range of any outward science, or even of any merely dogmatic ethical teaching. It was the inner spirit of the reader, through his own inner spirit, that he sought to touch. These "thinkings to himself" filled his soul with an emotion demanding a peculiar style of utterance, having some kind of rhythmical flow as its easiest and most fitting vehicle. Why it is, that when the soul muses, or when, under the influence of devout feeling, or inspiring wonder, it is thus moved to talk to itself, it should immediately seek some kind of measured language, is a question not easily answered. It presents a deep problem in psychology which cannot here be considered. The fact is undoubted. The rhythmical want is felt in ethical and philosophical musing, as well as in that which comes from the contemplation of the grand and beautiful in nature, or the heroic and pathetic in human deeds. Some have denied that what is called gnomic, or philosophical poetry is strictly such, being, as they say, essentially prose, artificially arranged for certain purposes of memory and impression. We may test the difference, however, by carefully considering what is peculiar, outwardly and inwardly, to some of the most striking examples of this kind of writing, and noting how the power, character, and association of the

Digitized by Google

thoughts are affected by the rhythmical dress, even when of the simplest kind. Pope's Essay on Man, for example, has been called simply measured prose; but it is in fact, the highest style of poetry, better entitled to be so characterized than the greater part of his other rhythmical compositions. Certain great ideas belonging to the philosophy of the world and man, are there contemplated in their emotional aspect. Wonder, which enters into the very essence of this highest species of poetry, is called by Plato "the parent of philosophy," and this is the reason why the dry and logical Aristotle, who could intellectually analyze what he could not emotionally create, gives us that remarkable declaration (*De Poetica*, chap. ix.) *διὸ καὶ φιλοσοφώτερον καὶ σπουδαιότερον* ΠΟΙ'ΗΣΙΣ *ἱστοριας ἐστίν*—"Wherefore it is that poetry is a more philosophical and a more *serious thing* than history itself." In perusing the composition of Pope referred to, we are immediately, and without formal notice, made to feel this contemplative, wondering, emotive power, through the sympathetic influence of the outward dress. The measured style thus disposes us as soon as we begin to read. We are thereby put in harmony with the subjective state of the writer. We begin to muse as he muses, whilst the rhythmical flow causes our emotions, and associations of thought, to move easily, and without surprise, in the same smooth channel, however irregular it might seem if viewed under another aspect. We are not reading for knowledge, or ethical instruction even, but for the reception of that same emotion which prompted the seemingly irregular utterance. Under the binding influence of the melody, we no longer expect logical or scientific connections. There is felt to be a uniting under-current of thought and feeling, so carrying us along as to supply the want of these by the merest suggestions, some of them, at times, very far off, seemingly, whilst others come like inspirations to the meditative spirit, or seem to rise up spontaneously from the bubbling fountain of emotional ideas. Taking away the rhythm from such a work immediately does it great injustice, by destroying this sympathy. Put it in a prose dress, and we, at once, expect closer connections, more logical, more scientific, more formal, more directly addressed to an outward mind. The one soul of the writer and the reader is severed, the inspiration is lost, the dogmatic becomes predominant, whilst the intellect itself is offended for the want of those stricter formulas of speech and argument which its systematic instruction demands. Not finding these, we call it strange, rhapsodical, or unmeaning. What before impressed us now appears as trite truisms, and the fastidious intellect, or fastidious taste, contemns what a deeper department of the soul had before received and valued without questioning. The cause of this is in the fact that there are some thoughts, called common (and it may be that they are indeed very common), yet so truly great, that to a mind in a right state for their contemplation, no commonness can destroy the sense of their deep intrinsic worth. Truisms may be among the most important of all *truths*, and, therefore, all the more needing some impressive style of utterance, some startling form of diction, to arouse the soul to a right contemplation of their buried excellence. Undeterred by their commonness, the musing mind sees this higher aspect; it recognizes them in their connections with the most universal of human relations, and even with eternal destinies. The emotion with which this is contemplated calls out a peculiar phraseology, placing the thought in the foreground of the mind's attention, and divesting it of its ordinary homely look. This startling diction appears especially in the original language, if understood. We turn such meditations into prose; first in our words, as happens necessarily in a process of rigid, verbal translation,—then in our thoughts—and having thus stripped them of that rhythmical charm which called attention to their hidden worth, their real uncommonness, we pronounce them trite and unmeaning.*

Koheleth in his homely prose version—especially our English Version—suffers more, in this

*[Such common-places abound in the best poetry, ancient or modern. Often, when rightly set, they furnish its most precious gems. Especially is this the case with the more sombre and meditative poetry, as in YOUNG's *Night Thoughts*, and the more serious poems of TENNYSON. "Many of the ideas of his *In Memoriam*," says a certain critic, "are the merest common-places; strip them of their stilted verbiage, and there is nothing left but the most vapid truisms." Such criticism is, itself, both vapid and shallow. Common ideas have their uncommon or wonderful aspects, which the common mind fails to see, or loses sight of because of their supposed commonness. Thus, time presents a very ordinary conception, but think of it in connection with its infinite past, its infinite future, its infinitesimal present, or as an immeasurable cycle repeating itself, and "demanding the ages fled," as Koheleth represents it (chap. i. 10; iii. 15), and how full of the most solemn awe, as well as the deepest personal interest. Take, for example, one of the most ordinary truisms that we find in almost every mouth: "The past is gone, we can never recall it." How tame and prosaic it sounds when presented

Digitized by Google

way, than the Psalms or Proverbs, where the Hebrew parallelism is so clear in its general structure, and the antithesis of emphatic words demanded for each particular arrangement is so striking, that the poetical character appears in almost any version; the poorest translation, that has any claim to be faithful, not being able wholly to disguise it.

The object, therefore, is to give to a translation of Koheleth such a rhythmical dress, be it ever so slight and plain, that the reader may thereby make some approach to the mental position of the original utterer, or assume, instinctively, as it were, something of his subjective state. It is to lead him, by something in the outward style, to feel, however slightly, the meditative, emotional, yet sobered spirit of the writer—to give the mind that turn—(and a mere starting impulse may do it) which shall make it muse as he muses, and soliloquize as he soliloquizes, without being surprised at those sudden transitions, or those remote suggestions, which seem natural to such a state of mind when once assumed. They *are* natural, because the writer, understanding his own thoughts, and even feeling them, we may say, needs, for himself, no such logical formulas, and the reader equally dispenses with them as he approaches the same position. They are like modulations that are not only admissible but pleasing in a musical flow, whilst they would appear as flattened chords, or harsh dissonances, if set loose from their rhythmical band. Such is very much the appearance which the thoughts of this book often present when read merely as didactic prose, and this is doing them great injustice. For one example out of many, of these seemingly abrupt transitions in Koheleth, take chap. vi. 6: "unto one place go not all men alike?" There seems, at first view, little or no connection here. It is, however, the meeting of an objection that silently starts up, making itself felt rather than perceived as something formally stated: "Length of life is no advantage, rather the contrary, if one has *lived in vain:* Do not they both, the man of extreme longevity, and the still-born, or the *born in vain*, go at last to the same mother earth whence they came?" What avails, then, "his thousand years twice told?" If the reader's mind is in harmony with the writer's, and with his style, he sees the association, and is more affected by such apparent abruptness than he would have been by the most formal logical statement. He gets into the current of feeling, and this carries him over the apparent logical break.

It may be said, too, that such a rhythmical Version may be all the more faithful to the thought on this very account of its rhythmical form. It may be more literal, too, if by literal we mean that which most truly puts us in the mental position of the old writer, giving not only the thought, as a bare intellectual form, but, along with it, the *emotion* which is so important a part of the total effect, and even of the *thought* itself regarded as an integral state of soul. To accomplish this, Hebrew intensives must be represented, in some way, by English intensives, of like strength, though often of widely different expression. There is often, too, an emotional power in a Hebrew particle which may be all lost if we aim to give only its illative force. This is especially the case with a גַּם or a כִּי. The former always expresses more or less of surprise or wonder, along with its additive force of *too*, or *moreover*. The translation is to be helped, in

---

merely as a truth or dogma. But give it a subjective interest such as comes from the diction and association in which YOUNG presents it, and how full of emotion!

Hark! 'tis the knell of my departed hours;
Where are they? With the years beyond the flood;

or as it appears in the Hebrew parallelism of Koheleth (chap. vii. 24):

Far off! the past—where is it?
Deep! a deep, O who shall find it?

Or as the kindred thought meets us in the musings of TENNYSON:

But the tender grace of a day that is dead,
Will never come back to me.

Of course, it will never come back. As a mere fact, or preceptive statement, we want no teacher, inspired or uninspired, to tell us that. But what, then, has changed the dry truism into a thought so full of the most touching interest that we read the simple lines over and over again, wondering at the strange power that is in them. It is in the rhythm, some would say. This is true, but not in the mere auricular sense. The rhythm *has* an effect, though the measure is of the simplest kind. It will be found, however, on analysis, to consist in the fact of its disposing the reader to the meditative or subjective state of soul. It sets the mind soliloquizing, unconsciously, as it were. It makes the thought and language seem, for the moment, as though they were the reader's own. It brings the idea to him in its emotional rather than in its intellectual, or dogmatic, aspect. In other words, it presents the *uncommon* side of the seeming truism. It is not only a deep view of being in general, but it is one that belongs to himself; and this is the secret of his emotion.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

such cases, by our expressive particle *yea*, or some interjectional form such as, *ah! this too! yea, verily, this too!* Again, the illative power in the Hebrew particle may be much wider, and more varied, than that of any single one which we may select as corresponding to it in any single case. Thus כִּי connects by denoting a *cause, reason,* or *motive;* but it may be a reason *against*, a reason *notwithstanding*, as well as a reason *for;* just as the Greek ἕνεκα may mean *for the sake* of, or *in spite of,—for all that—*as ἕνεκα ἐμοῦ, "on my account," or *for all that I can do*. In the latter case כִּי should be rendered *although*, a meaning rare in other parts of the Bible, but quite common, we think, in Ecclesiastes, and furnishing the right key to some otherwise obscure passages. Thus in chap. vi. 4, כִּי־בַהֶבֶל בָּא is rendered, "*for* he cometh in with vanity," which simply inverts the illative aim of the particle as determined by the context. It reads as though the "coming in with vanity and departing in darkness," were assigned as the cause, or reason why, the abortion, or the "*vainly born*," is better than he who "*vainly lived*,"—thus making it the *reason* why instead of the *reason notwithstanding*, as it truly is. When we render it *although*, and supply the same particle in all the connected clauses, the meaning, which is so confused in our common English Version, becomes not only clear but most impressive. Again, this very frequent little word may be a transition, or starting particle, denoting a *reason*, and an *emotion* connected with it, but this emotion arising from an under-current of thought, or from something that starts up to the mind during a pause in the soliloquizing discourse. The speaker sets off again with a כִּי, *yet, surely, yea verily so is it;* as though what he had been thinking must have been thought by others near him. There are quite numerous examples of this kind in Koheleth, but the best illustration may be taken from a passage in Job where the ultimate thought is very similar to the one which pervades this book. To explain it there is required the very admissible supposition of a brief pause, or silence, holding still the flow of the discourse after some impassioned utterance. This is in accordance with the nature of grave oriental speaking, whether dialectical or continuous. It may be said, too, that such pauses of emotional silence, though occupying much shorter intervals in the middle of the dialogue, are of the same kind, and of the same spirit, with the silence described Job ii. 13: "And they sat with him on the earth seven days, and seven nights, and none spake a word unto him, for they saw that his grief was very great." Some such rest of silence may be supposed to have occurred after the impassioned close of the xxvii. chapter. We are almost driven to this view from the fact, that the xxviii. seems to have so little of direct, or, in fact, of any discoverable connection with it. When Job begins again "to take up his parable," his thoughts seem to have drifted to a great distance; and yet, during the silence, the thread has been preserved. It has been carried away by a devious current, but we recover it again before the new strain closes. So great has seemed the difficulty of connecting these two chapters, that PAREAU (*De Jobi Notitiis, etc.*, p. 247) reasons plausibly to show that there has been a misplacement, and that chap. xxviii. should come immediately after chap. xxvi. But there is a better explanation, and more in harmony with the spirit of this wonderful book. After the strong appeal of the xxvii., and the vivid picture, there presented, of the bad man's ruin, we find Job, instead of applying it directly to his own defence, or his defence of the ways of God, starting off in a strange manner, and with this particle כִּי, presenting no reason for what was said, seemingly, just before, but forming, as it were, the transition chord to a new modulation: "*For* there is a vein for the silver" (כִּי יֵשׁ) or, "*surely* there is an outlet for the silver, and a place for the gold," *etc.* What is the illative force of כִּי in this place, or what connective office does it perform at all? Far off, as it would seem, from the former train of thought, the speaker goes on to describe the human zeal and energy in its search for the treasures and secrets of nature. And most graphically is this done. The references in the beginning are to mining operations, in which men had made what might seem a wonderful progress in the earliest times: "He (man) puts a limit to the darkness" [he pushes farther and farther back the horizon of the unknown]; "he searches out *to the very end* (as CONANT well translates it) the stone (the ore) of darkness, and of the shadow of death." Away from the ordinary human haunts "he hangs suspended" (over the shaft of the mine). In wilds which even "the vulture's eye had not seen, nor the fierce lion ventured

Digitized by Google

to tread, he sendeth forth his hand, and turneth up the mountain from its roots." "He cutteth out channels in the rocks,—he bindeth the fountains from overflowing, and that which is most hidden bringeth he forth to light." Now what is the association of thought that led to this? We soon see it. It reappears in that yearning interrogatory: "*But where shall wisdom be found? O where is the place of understanding?*" All these discoveries, however great they may be conceived to be (and the searching appeal is as much to our own as to the earliest times) are not wisdom—הַחָכְמָה—"*the* wisdom." They give us not the great idea or reason of God in the creation of man and the world: "The deep" (the great Tehom) still "saith, it is not in me; the sea saith, it is not with me." "It is not found in the land of the living," in the world of active life; and yet, strange as it may seem, "a rumor thereof" has reached the dark, silent unboasting under-world. "Death and Abaddon (the state in which man seems *to be lost*, or to disappear) say, we have just heard the fame thereof with our ears." It is the wisdom which is known only to God, or to those to whom He reveals it,—His moral purpose in the origination and continuance of nature, and in the dark dispensations of human life. It is the spiritual idea of the supernatural world, to which the natural is wholly subservient, but to which neither its ascending or descending links do ever reach. To this, all unknown as it is, though firmly believed, does Job appeal in repelling the shallow condemnation of his friends, and the shallow grounds on which they place it. This is God's wisdom, which was with Him when He made nature and the worlds. Man's wisdom is to believe in it, to submit himself to it, to stand in awe of it, and to depart from evil, as the beginning of that course through which alone there can come any clearing of the mystery to the human soul. This connects the speaker with the former train of thought, or the vindication of God's ways as righteous, however dark they may seem in the human history, whether of the race or of the individual. The pause, the apparent break, is that which leads to the higher strain. So it is in the musings of Koheleth, less sublime, perhaps, less impassioned, but with no less of grave impressiveness. It is only when we thus read it as meditating, soul-interrogating, poetry, that we get in the right vein for understanding its subtle associations of thought.

In Koheleth, too, as in Job, there are certain underlying ideas, firmly held, and that never change. Though "clouds and darkness are round about" them, they form the מְכוֹן כִּסֵּא "the foundation of the throne,"—the settled basis of his belief in the eternal Righteousness. These no scepticism ever invades. They have not the appearance of inductions from experience, or from any kind of logical argumentation; neither are they so put forth. They are rather holy *intuitions*, inspirations we might style them, which admit of no uncertainty: "*I know* that whatsoever God doeth is for the olam," the eternity, the world idea; "nothing can be put to it nor any thing taken from it" (iii. 14). Earth may be full of wrong, but "there is One Most High above all height, that keepeth watch" over the injustice and oppression of men (v. 7): "Though a sinner do evil a hundred times, and his days be prolonged, yet *surely I know* that it shall be well with them that fear God, but it shall not be well with the wicked" (viii. 12). He *knew* it; his faith not only went beyond sight, but stood strong even in opposition to sense and earthly experience: "I said in my heart, the righteous and the wicked God shall judge;" for "*there*, too" (שָׁם, even *there*, in the great Olam, or world plan, mentioned just above), "is there an appointment for every purpose, and for every work" (iii. 17). This judgment will not be merely through blind "physical consequences," as though it were man's highest duty to obey nature [according to a favorite modern system of naturalizing ethics], instead of ofttimes having to fight against it,—but by a glorious and unmistakable manifestation of God Himself, somewhere in the *malkuth kol olamim*, or cycle of the Olams. It shall be "when God demands again the ages fled" [iii. 15], יְבַקֵּשׁ אֶת נִרְדָּף, literally, "*makes inquisition*," or "seeks that which is pursued." As the solemn proclamation is sent after the fleeing homicide, so shall He demand again the ages of wrong that have chased away each other in the revolutions of time. They shall be summoned to stand before His bar. The past is not gone; it is to appear again in the judgment, as real as in the events for which it is to be judged. Yea, more *real* will be that reappearing than any thing in the unheeded movements of the present. Neither will it be the exhibition of a general or abstract justice: "For God will bring *every work* into judgment with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil" [xii. 14]. It is this strong Hebrew

Digitized by Google

faith in the Holy Justice which the Rationalist commentators overlook in their absurd comparing of some things in this book with the dogmas of the later* Grecian schools. It wholly severs the reverent, God-fearing Koheleth from the sensual Epicurean, on the one hand, and the fatalizing, naturalizing Stoic, on the other. His darkness is better than their light, his very doubts are more suggestive than their most "positive philosophy." It is this God-fearing, yet man-loving, spirit, that makes his calm utterances so much more impressive than all their babbling disputations about pleasure and pain, the *summum bonum*, and the reality of evil. All good, he teaches, is from God, even the power to find any satisfaction in eating and drinking (ii. 24, when rightly interpreted, v. 18, 19), and yet again, "sorrow is better than mirth" (viii. 3), not on account of any ascetic merit in the endurance of pain and grief, but because a saddened state of soul is more in sympathy with a sad and fallen world, such as the writer evidently conceives it to be [see vii. 29; ix. 3; iii. 18]. "Sorrow is better than mirth," because it has more heart, more thought; it is more becoming, more humane, and, therefore, more *rational* in view of the vanity of life, and its abounding woes. It is better, as purifying and beautifying the soul, and thus producing, in the end, a serener happiness (vii. 3).

"For in the sadness of the face the heart becometh *fair*;"

as יִיטַב לֵב should be rendered, giving a clear and impressive antithesis, and being in accordance with the more common usage of the phrase, as denoting *comeliness*, or even cheerfulness of spirit, rather than moral improvement merely, as our common version gives it: As the face is outwardly marred by such grief for the woes of human life, the heart grows inwardly in serene spiritual beauty. Never was this more impressively illustrated than in the life of the "Man of sorrows," whose "visage was so marred more than any man, and his form more than the sons of men" (Isaiah lii. 14; liii. 3).

These great underlying ideas of Koheleth, and the manner in which they appear, form its most peculiar characteristic. It is its recognition that distinguishes the thoughtful reader from the one who would flippantly characterize the style of the book as homely, and its thoughts as confused and common-place. These immutable truths may be compared to a strong and clear under current of most serious thinking, rising, at times, above the fluctuating experiences that appear upon the surface and as constantly losing themselves in the deeper flow. It is the feeling of this under current that may be said to form the subjective band of thought. It furnishes the true ground of that rich suggestiveness which pervades the whole composition, and thus constitutes an important element of its poetical character.

In giving a rhythmical version, however plain, to such a book as Koheleth, it should be borne in mind that some degree of inversion as well as measured or parallelistic movement, is among the demands of the poetical style in all languages. Such inversion, however, exists to a much less degree in the Hebrew, than in the Latin and Greek, and may, therefore, be more easily represented in English. In truth, a version may be made more clear, and more literal, as well as more musical, in this very way. It may sometimes be accomplished by a faithful following of the original in its scantiness as well as in its fulness. Our English version of the Bible inserts in italics the substantive verb where it is not in the Hebrew. It does this, often, to the marring of the thought, and the enfeebling of the emotion: "From everlasting unto everlasting thou *art*;" how much more forcible, and, at the same time, more rhythmical, the literal following of the Hebrew: *from everlasting thou*. This may seem a very slight difference, but the effect on a wide scale, had such literal following been

*[The *earlier* Greek ideas, as manifested in their solemn dramatic poetry, before the Epicurean philosophy had been fully introduced, remind us strikingly, sometimes, of the language and ideas of the Bible. Nowhere else, out of the Scriptures, is this doctrine of retributive justice, and its awful certainty, more sternly set forth. The manner of expression, sometimes, shocks our more merciful Christian ideas; yet still we recognize in them the primitive dogma of the divine unfailing Justice, as inseparable from the divine Power and Wisdom:

ἡ παλαίφατος
ΔΙΚΗ ξύνεδρος Ζηνὸς ἀρχαίοις νόμοις·

DIKÉ, renowned of old,
Who shares, by ancient laws, the throne of Jove.

SOPH. *Œd.*, Col. 1381.—T. L.]

constantly practised, would have been very strongly felt. "Vanity of vanities," says our English version, "all *is* vanity." Leave out the useless substantive verb: "Vanity of vanities, all—vanity." A very slight change again, but it has more effect for the ear, as well as for the feeling. It is no longer an abstract, dogmatic affirmation, but an exclamation of wonder. Intensive phrases, however, generally refuse a strict verbal rendering, unless they have become naturalized, as it were, in our language, through a long used literal translation of the Scriptures, or in any other way. Thus that oft-repeated "vanity of vanities" (the Hebrew use of the construct. state with the plural for something superlative) may stand as it does, instead of being rendered "*most vain*," or "*utterly vain*." So again for the Hebrew סוֹבֵב סֹבֵב (i. 6), the most literal is the best sounding, as well as the most forcible translation: "*Whirling, whirling*," or "*round, round*,"—"*round about, round about*"—instead of our tame and prosaic rendering: "it *whirleth about continually*," or the still poorer Vulgate: *Lustrans universa in circuitu*. In other cases, a verbal rendering will not do at all; and yet in some way, must their intensiveness be given, or it is no true translation,—that is, no translation, or *setting over*, of what is most essential, which, in such a book as Koheleth, is the *emotion*, the state of soul, rather than the bare description or ethical *thought*. Thus, for example, in the Hebrew, the plural is sometimes used to express what is superlative or very great; as in chap. ii. 8, the expression שִׁדָּה וְשִׁדּוֹת, which, in our English version is most strangely rendered, "musical instruments and *that of all sorts*." The best Jewish authority regarded שִׁדָּה as the feminine of שַׁד, the common word for the breast, used here (the only case of its occurrence) as more feminine and voluptuous, and representative of Solomon's numerous wives and concubines. See Kimchi, and Aben Ezra who cites as a parallel phrase, רַחַם רַחֲמָתַיִם ("*a damsel or two*," expressed euphemistically) Judges v. 30. Now render this literally, "a breast and breasts," and how tame it sounds; how bare is it of all emotion! We want something to express this intensive sense, be it an intensive particle, or any other intensive word—"*the breast, yea, many breasts*,"—the seven hundred fair female bosoms on which Solomon, in "the days of his vanity," had the choice of reposing. The manner of saying it, and the feeling with which it is said, would furnish no slight argument that it is a real, and not merely a representative Solomon, who is speaking here. Sometimes this emotion, this intensity, is expressed, or rather suggested, simply by the rhythmical form of the translation, even though it be of the slightest kind;—the inverted or measured style immediately indicating such an emotional state of soul, as other language, in another order, would not have done. For all these reasons, it is no paradox to assert, that a rhythmical version of the book, such as is here attempted, may be the most true and literal, placing the reader's soul in some degree of harmony with that of the writer, not only as regards the general subject, but also in respect to the true thought and feeling of particular passages. To answer this purpose, there is need only of such a degree of inversion as our language most easily admits, and which might have been much more freely used than it has been in our common version. Such a style, freely employed in rendering all the poetical books, would have become naturalized in English through this very means. It might have been called prose, but would have had much more of the power of the poetical, and would have enabled us, whilst rendering most literally, to have entered more deeply into the thought of the sacred books through the emotion which is such an essential accompaniment of the thought, and of which a poor prose translation almost wholly divests it. In addition to this more inverted style, there is required only the simplest iambic movement, made as smooth as possible, but without much regard to the equality of the lines. The Version accompanying may be open to criticism in these respects, but the effect would, in fact, be weakened by having it too labored, even if that could be consistent with literalness. In short, there is wanted, for such a purpose, just enough of rhythm to arrest the attention, and set the mind in the direction of the inward harmony, without occupying it with an excessive artificialness. On these accounts it is hoped that the attempted rhythmical version will give the reader a better *view*, by giving him a better *feeling* of Koheleth (both as a whole, and in its parts) than can come from the very homely and defective prose translation of our English Bible, or even from the German

Digitized by Google

of Zöckler, which is rhythmical only in appearance; since it simply follows the Hebrew accents in the divisions of the parallelisms, which are less evident in this book than in other parts of the Bible styled poetical. In the version offered, there is very little of what can be called addition or paraphrase. Some few places there are, in which brief explanatory words have been placed in parenthetical brackets, but they are not used to any greater extent than the explanations and connections that are found in the marginal readings of our English Version. These additions, though marked by enclosing lines, are included in the measured movement, and may, therefore, be read without interrupting it. They show the connections of thought, which are virtually in the Hebrew, in cases, often, where a verbal translation would fail to exhibit the full power of its conciseness. In such instances they are not additions, nor explanatory paraphrases, but genuine parts of a true translation. In other cases, the mere inversion discloses the association of thought, which we fail to see in the common rendering, because its unhebraical order divests certain words of that emphasis through which the connection is plainly marked in the original—more plainly, sometimes, than by any logical terms of assertion.

The measure employed is the Iambic, with occasional use of the Choriambus. The most usual lines are the pentameter, or the common English blank verse line, the Iambic of seven feet, the most musical of our English measures, with, occasionally, the less musical, because less used, Senarius. The shorter lines, of three or four feet, are used for the transitions and cadences which mark the flow of thought. One who carefully compares it with the original will see that the translation here attempted keeps to the Hebrew accentual divisions, with very rare exceptions, and, in most cases, (although a somewhat difficult task) to the measure of their verbal conciseness. Some few parts are regarded as bare prose, and are given accordingly, such as the first verse of the book, the passages from ver. 12 to ver. 14, and verses 16 and 17, of the first chapter, as also verses 9 and 10 of the twelfth chapter. These are viewed as simply introductory to what follows. Without at all affecting our view of the authenticity and inspiration of the book, they may be regarded as scholiastic prologues, or epilogues, made by some other hand, as explanatory of the whole poem, or of some particular things in it; as, for example, verses 9 and 10 of chap. xii. seem to be an added note (by some enthusiastic admirer, himself divinely guided) to show that Solomon's own language answers the description given in verse 11 that follows, beginning: "words of the wise, *etc.*" The reader will find remarks on these, both by Zöckler and the editor, in their respective places.—T. L.]

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

METRICAL VERSION.

SAYINGS OF KOHELETH,

SON OF DAVID, KING IN JERUSALEM.

N. B.—The marginal numbers denote the chapters and verses of the common English Version. The smaller figures in the text refer to the brief notes in the margin, explanatory of differences between this and the common Version, or referring to pages where such explanations may be found.

I.

The introductory Thought and constant Refrain. Continual cyclical changes in Nature and in Human Life. Nothing new beneath the sun.

CHAPTER I.

2 O vanity of vanities! Koheleth saith;
O vanity of vanities! all—vanity.
3 What gain to man in all his toil, he toils beneath the sun?
4 One generation goes, another comes;
But the earth for the world[1] abides.
5 Outbeams[2] the sun, and goes beneath, the sun;
Then to his place, all panting,[3] glowing,—there again is he.
6 Goes to the South, the wind, then round to North again;
Still round and round it goes;
And in its circuits evermore returns the wind.
7 The rivers all are going to the sea;
And yet the sea is never full;
Whence came the rivers, thither they return to go.
8 All words[4] but labor; man can never utter it.
With seeing, eye is never satisfied;
With hearing, ear is never filled.
9 What WAS is what again SHALL BE;
What has been made, is that which shall be made;
There's nothing new beneath the sun.
10 Is there a thing of which 'tis said, Lo this is new?
It hath already been in worlds that were before.
11 Of former things the memory is gone;
Of things to come shall no remembrance be
With those that shall come after.

I. [1] See p. 45.—[2] P. 35, Text Note to v. 5.—[3] P. 38, note.—[4] P. 39, and Text Note, pp. 35, 36.

Digitized by Google

II.

Koheleth gives an account of himself, his kingly estate, his pre-eminence in Wisdom and experience, with meditations on the fruitlessness of human efforts, and the sorrows of knowledge. Prose mingled with verse.

CHAPTER I.

12, 13 I Koheleth was king over Israel in Jerusalem, and I set my heart to seek and to explore
by wisdom all that is done beneath the sun,—That painful study which God has given
to weary with.

14 I looked on all the works performed beneath the sun;
And Lo! all vanity, a chasing[5] of the wind.
15 That which is crooked cannot be made straight;
The lacking can't be numbered.

16 Then said I in my heart, Lo! I have become great; I have increased in wisdom beyond
17 all before me in Jerusalem; my heart hath seen much wisdom, and knowledge. Yea, I
set my heart to know wisdom,—to know vain glory, too, and folly. This also did I see
to be a caring for the wind.

18 For in much of wisdom there is much of grief;
And who increaseth knowledge, still increaseth sorrow.

III.

The Attempt to unite Pleasure and Wisdom—Figure of the Unruly Horse—The reining of the Flesh—The Heart guiding as Charioteer—Koheleth's ample means for the Experiment—Its wretched Failure—All Vanity.

CHAPTER II.

1 Then said I in my heart again—
Go to—I'll try thee now with pleasure.
Behold the GOOD. This, too, was vanity.
2 Of laughter, said I, it is mad;
Of mirth—O what availeth it?
3 Then in my heart I made deep search,—
To rein[6] my flesh in wine;
My heart in wisdom guiding;
To take near hold of folly, till I saw
What kind of good is that for Adam's sons
Which they would get, the numbered days they live,
Beneath the heavens.
4 Great works I did.
Houses I builded, vineyards did I plant,
5 Gardens and parks; fruit trees of every kind
6 I planted there. I made me water pools,
To water thence the wood luxuriant[7] of trees.
7 I gat me serving men, and serving women;
Thralls of my house were born to my estate;
Whilst store of cattle, yea of flocks were mine,
Surpassing all before me in Jerusalem.
8 I gathered to me also silver—gold,—
Treasures of kings, the wealth of provinces.
I gat me singing men, and singing women.
That choice delight of Adam's sons was mine,—
The breast[8]—yea many breasts.
9 So I was great, and grew in greatness more than all
Who were before me in Jerusalem.
My wisdom also still stood firm to me.

II. [5] P. 36, Text Note to v. 14. III. [6] P. 54, third note.—[7] P. 56, first note.—[8] P. 56, second note.

Digitized by Google

10 Of all mine eyes did ask I nought refused.
My heart I held not back from any joy.
For joyful was my heart in all my toil;
And this my portion was from all my toil.
11 Then looked I to the work my hands had wrought,
The labor I had labored in the doing;
And Lo! all vanity—a chasing of the wind;
No gain beneath the sun.

IV.

Contemplation of Wisdom and Folly—Koheleth is sure that Wisdom far excels Folly—But he is puzzled to see how slight the practical Difference in Life—One seeming Chance to all—All alike forgotten—Koheleth's Grief—His Hatred of Life and Discontent.

CHAPTER II.

12 Again I turned to think of wisdom, madness, folly;
For what shall he do who succeeds the king?
[What else than] that which they have done already.
13 As light excels the darkness, so I thought[9]
There surely must be gain to wisdom over folly.
14 The wise man's eyes are in his head [they say[10]],
The fool in darkness walketh.
And yet I know that one event awaits them all.
15 Then said I in my heart
Like the fool's chance so hath it chanced to me;
And wherefore, then, am I the wiser?
I told my heart, this, too, was vanity.
16 As of the fool, so also of the wise;
There's no remembrance that abides forever;[1]
In that the days are coming—have already come—
When all is clean forgotten.
Alas![2] how is it that the wise should die as dies the fool!
17 And then I hated life.
For grievous seemed the work performed beneath the sun,
Since all is vanity—a chasing of the wind.
18 I hated also all the labor I had wrought.
For I must leave it to a man who shall come after me.
19 Will he be wise or foolish? who can know?
Yet he will rule in all for which I've toiled,
In all I've wisely planned beneath the sun.
This, too, was vanity.

V.

Koheleth's Desperation—All vanity again.

CHAPTER II.

20 Thus I revolved[3] until it made my heart despair,
Of all the labor I had wrought beneath the sun.
21 For so it is; there's one whose toil is evermore
In wisdom, knowledge, rectitude;
And then to one who never toiled he yields it as his prize.
O this is vanity—an evil very sore.

IV. [9] P. 53, Text Note to v. 13.—[10] P. 58, proverbial saying.—[1] P. 58, second note.—[2] P. 58, third note. V. [3] P. 59, second note.

Digitized by Google

22 For what remains to man in all his labor?
In all his heart's sore travail, as he toils beneath the sun?
23 Since all his days are pain, his occupation grief.
This, too, is vanity.

VI.

The true Good not in the power of man—Who could do more to find it than Koheleth? All the gift of God.

CHAPTER II.

24 The good is not in[4] man that he should eat and drink,
And find his soul's enjoyment in his toil.
This, too, I saw, is only from the hands of God.
25 For who could more indulge?
Who faster, farther, run[5] (in such a race) than I?
26 To him who hath found favor in His sight
Doth God give wisdom, knowledge, joyfulness;
But to the sinner gives He travail sore,
To hoard and gather for the man whom he approves.
This, too, was vanity—a caring for the wind.

VII.

A time for every thing. The great world time, or world-problem, which men can never find out.

CHAPTER III.

1 To every thing there is a time,
A season fit, to every purpose under heaven;
2 A time to be born—a time to die,
A time to plant—a time to dig up what is planted,
3 A time to kill—a time to heal,
A time to break—a time to build again,
4 A time to weep—a time to laugh,
A time to mourn—a time to dance,
5 A time to scatter stones—a time to gather them again,
A time to embrace—a time to refuse embracing,
6 A time to seek—a time to lose,
A time to keep—a time to cast away,
7 A time to rend—a time to sew,
A time to hold one's peace—a time to speak,
8 A time to love—a time to hate,
A time of war—a time of peace.
9 What gain to him who works, in that for which he labors?
10 I saw the travail God hath given the sons of men,
That they should toil therein.
11 Each in its several *time*, hath He made all things fair;
The *world-time*[6] also hath He given to human thought;
Yet so, that man, of God's great work, can never find,
The end from the beginning.

VI. [4] P. 60, note.—[5] P. 61, third note. VII. [6] P. 67, note, also Excursus on Olamic Words.

VIII.

In worldly things, enjoyment and success the only good proposed. This God's gift. The Inquisition of the Past.

CHAPTER III.

12 There is no other good *in them*, I know,
But to enjoy, and to *do well* in life;
13 Yea, more,—to every man,
That he should eat and drink, and find enjoyment in his toil—
    Even this is God's own gift.
14 For all God's work, I know, is for eternity.[7]
No adding to it—from it no diminishing.
And this He does that men may fear before Him.
15   What was is present now;
    The future has already been;
And God demands again the ages fled.[8]

IX.

The Injustice in the world—God's sure Judgment—God's trial of men to prove them—Human Life and its Destiny as judged by human conduct—"Man who is in honor and abideth not is like the beasts that perish"—One chance, seemingly, to all.

CHAPTER III.

16 Again I looked beneath the sun—
The place of judgment—wickedness was there.
The place of righteousness—I saw injustice there.
17 Then said I in my heart:
The righteous and the wicked God will judge.
For *there*,[9] too, unto every purpose, and for every work,
18   There is a time appointed.
This said I in my heart—because of Adam's sons—
When God shall try them—for themselves to see
That they—in their own estimation[10]—are as beasts.
19 (So seems it)—one event for man, for beast,—one doom for all.
As dieth this, so dieth that—one breath is for them all.
There is no pre-eminence to man above the beast.
    Since all is vanity.
20 Unto one place (the earth) go all alike.
All come from earth, and all to earth return.
21 For who (among them) is it that discerns,[1]
The spirit of the man that goeth up on high,
The spirit of the beast that downward goes to earth?
22 And so I saw there was (for them)[2] no higher good
Than that a man should joy in his own work,
    Since this his portion is.
For who shall take him there to see
    What shall be after him?

VIII. [7] Excursus on Olamic Words, p. 51.—[8] Excursus, p. 72. IX. [9] P. 69, note.—[10] P. 70, 71, note.—[1] P. 72, note.—[2] The same.

Digitized by Google

X.

Koheleth turns again—The sight of oppression changes the view—The Dead seem better off than the Living—Labor, when it prospers, only a source of envy—The envious fool's content in his idleness.

CHAPTER IV.

1 And then I turned again—
I looked on all the oppressions done beneath the sun.
For Lo! the tears of the oppressed, who had no comforter;
Whilst on the oppressors' side was power, to them no comforter.
2 O then I praised the dead who died long since,
More than the living men who now survive.
3 Ah! better than them both is that which hath not been,
Nor ever seen the evil work performed beneath the sun.
4 Again I thought of toil as prospering in its work,
That this is cause of hate to one man from his neighbor.
Yea, this is vanity, a caring for the wind.
5 The fool (in envy) folds his hands and his own flesh devours.
6 For better (saith he)[3] is the one hand full of quietness,
Than both hands full of toil and windy vain desire.

XI.

Another vanity—The lone Miser—The good of Society.

CHAPTER IV.

7 I turned to look again beneath the sun—
And Lo! another vanity!
8 There is one alone; he has no mate, no son or brother near,
And yet there is no end to all his toil.
With wealth his eyes are never satisfied.
Ah me![4] for whose sake do I labor so?
Or why do I keep back my soul from joy?
O this is vanity and travail sore.
9 Better are two than one, for then there is to them
A good reward in all their toil.
10 For if they fall, the one shall raise his friend.
But woe to him who falls alone, with none to lift him up.
11 If two together lie, they both have heat;
But how shall one be warm alone?
12 If one be stronger, two shall stand against him.
Nor quickly can the triple cord be broken.

XII.

Changes in the individual and political life—The lowly exalted, the high abased—Changes in the world-life—The passing generations.

CHAPTER IV.

13 Better the child, though he be poor, if wise,
Than an old and foolish king, who heeds no longer warning.
14 For out of bondage comes the one to reign;
The other, in a kingdom[5] born, yet suffers poverty.
15 I saw the living all, that walked *in pride*[6] beneath the sun.
I saw the second birth[7] that in their place shall stand.

X. [3] P. 81. XI. [4] P. 51, second note. XII. [5] Excursus, p. 84.—[6] The same.—[7] Excursus, p. 85.

Digitized by Google

16 No end to all the people that have gone before;
And they who still succeed, in them[8] shall find no joy.
This, too, is vanity, a chasing of the wind.

XIII.

Reverence in worship—In speaking—Observance of vows. Against superstition, dreams and fortune-telling—Fear God alone.

CHAPTER V.

N. B.—In the Hebrew this chapter begins with ver. 2.

1 O keep thy foot when to the house of God thou goest.
Draw nigh to hear.
'Tis better than to give the sacrifice of fools;
For they know not that they are doing evil.[9]
2 O be not hasty with thy mouth, nor let thy heart be rash
To utter words before the face of God.
For God in heaven dwells, thou here on earth.
Be, therefore, few thy words.
3 As in the multitude of care there comes the dream,
So, with its many words, the voice of fools.
4 When thou hast made a vow to God, defer not to fulfill.
He has no delight in fools—pay, then, as thou hast vowed.
5 'Tis better that thou shouldst not vow, than vow and not perform.
6 Give not thy mouth to cause thy flesh to sin;
Nor say before the angel:[10] "'twas an error."
Wherefore should God be angry at thy voice?
And why the labors of thy hands destroy?
7 Though dreams abound and vanities, presagings numberless,
Yet fear thou God.

XIV.

Be not stumbled at sight of oppression and oppressors—There are Higher Powers than they—And God is over all.

CHAPTER V.

8 When, in a province, thou beholdest the oppression of the poor,—
Bold robbery of judgment and of right;
At such allowance marvel not.
Since One most high, above all height, is keeping watch.
Yes—there be higher[1] far than they.
9 For every (rank) has profit from the soil,
The king himself owes[2] homage to the field.

XV.

Wealth never satisfies—The laborer's contented sleep.

CHAPTER V.

10 Who silver loves, with silver ne'er is satisfied,
Nor he who loves increase of wealth, with revenue.
This is another vanity:
11 When wealth increases, they increase who spend;
And what the owner's gain, except to see it with his eyes?
12 Sweet is the laborer's slumber, be it less he eat or more;
Whilst the abundance of the rich permits him not to sleep.

XII. [8] The same. XIII. [9] P. 89, and note p. 141.—[10] P. 90, second note. XIV. [1] P. 91, second note.—[2] P. 92, note.

Digitized by Google

XVI.

Another sore evil—The hoarding miser, who loses his wealth and dies poor—Darkness, Sickness, and Wrath.

CHAPTER V.

13 There is another grievous woe I've seen beneath the sun,—
Wealth hoarded to its owner's hurt.
14 With the sore travail (it had cost)[3] that wealth departs;
The son whom he begets is left with nothing in his hand.
14 Then bare, as from his mother's womb he issued forth,
Doth he return (to earth) poor as he came,
And nothing takes he of his toil to carry with him there.
16 O a sore evil this!
In all points as he came, so shall he go,
And what his profit that he thus should labor for the wind?
17 Yea, all his days doth he in darkness eat.
Abundant sorrow, sickness too is his,[4] and chafing wrath.

XVII.

The summing up of Koheleth's experience—The true Good, the *Good* that is *fair*—The ability to see good in anything is God's own gift—"His favor is more than life"—Makes the mere enjoyment of life little remembered.

CHAPTER V.

18 And now behold what I have seen!
GOOD[5] that is *fair*, to eat and drink, and see the good
In all the toil that one may toil beneath the sun,
The number of the days that God has given
19 To be his portion here—yea, every man,
As God has given him wealth and great estate,
And power to eat thereof,
To bear his portion, and be joyful in his toil—
THIS GOOD[6] (I say) is God's own gift.
20 For little will he call to mind, the days that he has lived,
When God doth thus respond to him in joyfulness of heart.

XVIII.

Koheleth turns again to the dark side—The rich man to whom God has not given the true good—compared to the untimely birth—He who vainly *lives*, less blessed than the vainly *born*

CHAPTER VI.

1 Another evil have I seen beneath the sun,
And great it is to man;
2 There is one whom God endows with wealth,
And store of goods, and glorious estate;
Who nothing lacks of all his soul desireth,
Yet God gives him no power to eat thereof;
For one, an alien[7] born, devoureth it;
This, too, is vanity, a very sore disease.
3 Though one beget a hundred sons—though he live many years,—
Yea, though to countless days his life extends—
His soul unsatisfied with good, and he no burial have;
The untimely born, I said, is better sure than he.

XVI. [3]P. 93, second note.—[4]P. 94, note. XVII. [5]P. 94, second note.—[6]The same. XVIII. [7]P. 99, first note.

Digitized by Google

4 For though[8] in vanity it comes, and into darkness goes,—
    And darkness cover deep its name,—
5 Though[8] it hath never seen the sun, nor aught hath ever known,—
Yet better rests (the vainly born) than HE [who vainly lived];
6 Yea, though he lived a thousand years twice told,
    Yet never saw the good.
Unto one place, go not all men alike?[8]

XIX.

Unsatisfactoriness of human life and efforts—To the Wise, the Fool, the Poor—Content better than the Wandering of the soul—The frailty and earthliness of man as indicated by his name Adam—He cannot strive with his Maker—Multiplication of words—They only increase vanity.

CHAPTER VI.

7 All toil of man is ever for his mouth;
And yet the appetite is never filled.
8 What profit to the wise ('tis asked)[9] beyond the fool?
What to the poor, though knowing how to walk before the living?
9 Better the eyes beholding (say)[10] than wandering of the soul.
    This, too, is vanity.
10 What each thing is, its name was named of old;
Known thus for *what he is*,[1] is ADAM (named from earth);
And that he cannot strive with One so far in might excelling.
11 Though many words there are, in vain they multiply;
    What profit then to man?
12 For who knows what is good for man in life,
The number of the days of his vain life,
He spendeth like a shadow gone? For who can tell to man
    What shall be after him beneath the sun?

XX.

The sorrowful aspects of life better than the jovial—Better than the song of fools the chidings of the wise—Here, too, there is vanity—Since insolence of station and bribery may cause even the wise to err.

CHAPTER VII.

1 Better the honored name than precious oil;
Better the day of death than that of being born.
2 Better to visit sorrow's house than seek the banquet hall;
Since that (reveals) the end of every man,
And he who lives should lay it well to heart.
3   Better is grief than mirth;
For in the sadness of the face the heart becometh[2] fair.
4 The wise man's heart is in the house of mourning;
The fool's heart in the house of mirth.
5 Better to heed the chiding of the wise
    Than hear the song of fools.
6 For like the sound of thorns beneath the pot,
So is the railing laughter of the fool.
    This, too, is vanity.
7 For even the wise may arrogance[3] inflate,
A bribe his heart corrupt.

XVIII. [8] P. 100, note also p. 177, Int. to Met. Ver. XIX. [9] [10] Question and Answer.—[1] P. 101, note. XX. [2] P. 179, Int. to Met. Vers.—[3] P. 106, note, and Text Note, p. 104.

Digitized by Google

XXI.

Sundry maxims—The end determines—Be patient—Fret not—No mark of Wisdom to praise the past—In Wealth there is defence of life, in knowledge life itself—In prosperity be joyful—In adversity be thoughtful—God hath set one over against the other.

CHAPTER VII.

8 Better the issue of a thing than the beginning.
Better the patient than the proud in soul.
9 O be not hasty in thy spirit angrily to grieve;
For in the bosom of the fool such anger ever dwells.
10 Say not, why is it, days of old were better days than these?
'Tis not from wisdom comes such questioning.
11 Wisdom is fair with fair inheritance;[4]
And gain excelling hath it then for men.
12 In Wisdom's shade, as in the shade of Wealth,
[Defence of life][5]; but knowledge hath pre-eminence (in this),
That wisdom *giveth life* to its possessor.

13 Survey the works of God;
For who can make that straight which He hath left deformed?
14 In days of good, be thou of joyful heart;
In evil days, look forth (consider thoughtfully)
How God hath set the one against the other,
That aught of that which cometh after man may never find.

XXII.

Koheleth's sad experience—the wicked prospering—the good depressed. Over-righteousness—Be not too knowing—The fear of God the only safety—Wisdom stronger than strength—None righteous, no, not one—Heed not slanders.

CHAPTER VII.

15 Much have I seen, of all kinds,[6] in my days of vanity.
The righteous man who perished in his righteousness;
The wicked man, with life prolonged in wickedness.
16 Nor over-righteous be, nor over-wise;
For why thyself confound?
17 Nor over-wicked be, nor play the fool;
Why die before thy time?
18 Better hold fast the one, nor from the other draw thy hand;
But he alone who feareth God comes out unscathed[7] from all.
19 One wise man there may be whom wisdom stronger makes,
Than ten the mightiest captains in the city;
20 But *one*,[8] a righteous man, on earth is never found,
Who doeth always good and sinneth not.
21 [Learn this] too, give not heed to every word that flies;
Lest thine own servant thou shouldst hear reviling thee;
22 For many the time, as thine own soul well knows,
That thou thyself hast other men reviled.

XXI. [4] P. 107, first note.—[5] P. 107, second note. XXII. [6] P. 108, first note.—[7] P. 109.—[8] P. 109, third note.

Digitized by Google

XXIII.

Koheleth's desire to learn the great past. He then turns to seek wisdom in human life. The evil woman—A good one hard to find—One man in a thousand. Man made upright; now fallen.

CHAPTER VII.

23 All this have I essayed for wisdom's sake.
O that I might be wise, I said, but it was far from me;
24 Far off—the past, what is it?[9] deep—that deep, O, who can sound?
25 Then turned I, and my heart, to learn, explore,
To seek out wisdom, reason—sin to know,—
Presumption,—folly,—vain impiety.
26 Than death more bitter did I find the wife
Whose heart is nets and snares, whose hands are chains.
The blest of God from her shall be delivered;
The sinner shall be taken.
27 Behold, this have I found, Koheleth saith;
[As reckoning] one by one, to sum the account;
28 That which my heart was ever seeking though I found it not:
Out of a thousand, one man have I found;
Amidst all these, one woman seek I still.
29 This only have I found—behold it,—God made man upright;
But they have sought devices numberless.

XXIV.

Wisdom lighteth up the face. Koheleth's kingly admonition—Submission to right authority. The rebellious spirit—Safety of obedience.

CHAPTER VIII.

1 Who like the wise, or him who knows the reason of a thing?
Man's wisdom lighteth up his face,—its aspect stern is changed.
2 I, a king's mouth (do speak it),[10] heed it well;
By reason, also, of the oath of God;
3 In anger, from the [ruler's] presence hasten not;
Nor boldly stand in any evil thing;
For that which he hath purposed will he do.
4 Where'er the mandate of a king, there, too, is power;
And who shall say to him, what doest thou?
5 Who simply keeps the statute knows[1] no harm;
Yet still, the wise in heart doth time and judgment heed.

XXV.

Man's evil great, yet reason and justice in it all—No resistance in the warfare with death. Impotency of wickedness.

CHAPTER VIII.

6 For surely unto every purpose is there time and judgment fixed,
Although[2] man's evil be so great upon him,
7 Unknowing, as he is, of all that is to come.
For how it shall be, who is there to tell him?
8 Over the spirit, none has power to hold it back;
No strength availeth in the day of death;
For in that warfare there is no release;
And wickedness is impotent to free the sinner there.

XXIII. [9] Note pp. 113, 114. XXIV. [10] P. 113, Text Note to v. 2.—[1] P. 117, note. XXV. [2] P. 118, first note.

Digitized by Google

XXVI.

A close survey—Power hurtful to its possessors—The wicked rulers dead—Buried in Pomp—Forgotten.

CHAPTER VIII.

9 This too I saw—'twas when I gave my heart
To every work that's done beneath the sun—
That there's a time when man rules over man to his own hurt.
10 'Twas when I saw the wicked dead interred;
And to and from[3] the holy place (men) came and went;
Then straight were they forgotten in the city of their deeds.
Ah! this was vanity.

XXVII.

Human presumption arising from impunity—Judgment slow but sure—No good to the sinner notwithstanding appearances—"Woe to the wicked, it shall be ill with him—Joy to the righteous, it shall be well with him."

CHAPTER VIII.

11 Since sentence on an evil work is not done speedily,
Therefore the hearts of Adam's sons are filled with thoughts of wrong.
12 Yet though the sinner sin a hundred times, with life prolonged,
Still know I this—it shall be well with those who worship God,—
Who stand in awe before Him.
13 But for the sinner there is nothing good;
Nor shall he lengthen out his days that like a shadow (flee),
This man who hath no fear (to sin) before the face of God.

XXVIII.

Koheleth's faith grows weak again—He stumbles at the sight of the same seeming chance to all—It is then that he extols pleasure—No good except to eat, *etc.*

CHAPTER VIII.

14 'Tis vanity, what's done upon the earth, for so it is,
That there are righteous unto whom it haps as to the vile,
And sinners, too, whose lot is like the doings of the just.
For surely this is vanity, I said.
15 'Twas then[4] that pleasure I extolled:
How that there was no good to man beneath the sun;
Except to eat, and drink, and here his joy to find;
And this alone attends him in his toil,
During all the days of life that God has given beneath the sun.

XXIX.

The mystery deepens—No human philosophy can solve the problem of life—We can only say, "all things are in the hands of God:" Human Love and Hatred—The unknown All as it bears upon all—The seeming outward confusion in moral states—The still greater invisible evil in the hearts of men—Then to the unknown after state—Hope in the living—The highest form of death inferior to the lowest life.

CHAPTER VIII.

16 According as I gave my heart to know what wisdom was,
And to explore the travail sore that's done upon the earth,
[So sore that day and night the eyes no slumber take]
17 'Twas then I saw that man can never find the work of God;
That work which now is going on beneath the sun.
For though one labor in the search, his search is all in vain.
Yea, though the sage[5] may boast his knowledge, still he finds it not.

XXVI. [3]P. 119, note. XXVIII. [4]P. 120, note. XXIX. [5]Pp. 67, 68, note.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER IX.

1 For this before my heart I set—all this to understand—
Even this (great mystery) how that the righteous and the wise,
With all their works, are in the hands of God.
Their love, their hatred too; man knows it not, the all[6] that lies before him;
2 The all according as it is to all—one fate to all—
The just, the vile, the good, the pure, the one with sin defiled;
To him who offers sacrifice—to him who gives it not;
As to the good, so unto him that sins;
As to the perjured, so to him who fears to break his oath.
3 Yes, this the evil sore in all that's done beneath the heavens:
That thus one doom should come to all alike.
And then, so full of evil are the hearts of Adam's sons!
Yea, madness in their hearts, whilst they do live;
Then to the dead they go.
4 For there is hope in one whose life still joins[7] the living throng.
To a living dog there's greater worth than to a lion dead.

XXX.

Koheleth's views of the state of the dead—Not as a state of extinction, but as opposed to the present active, loving, hating, scheming life—The unknown state of being to which there is no participation in the works of this world "beneath the sun."

CHAPTER IX.

5 The living know that they must die, the dead they nothing know.
For them there is no more reward, forgotten is their name.
6 Their hate, their love, their zeal, all perished now;
Whilst the world lasts, no portion more have they,
In all the works performed beneath the sun.

XXXI.

On this there follows a strain of sorrowing irony—[In language the opposite of 1 Cor. vii. 29]—Alas O man!—If it be all of life to live—Then go thy way, eat, drink thy wine—There is no judgment—God accepts thy works—Get all the good thou canst out of "thy day of vanity"—There is no work or scheme in Sheol. Comp. Wisdom of Solomon, II. 6.

CHAPTER IX.

7 Go then, with gladness eat thy bread, and merrily drink thy wine,
For God already hath accepted all thy works.
8 In every season be thy garments white,
And oil be never wanting to thy head.
9 Live joyful with the wife whom thou hast loved,
During all the days of thy vain life,—that life[8]
Which God hath given to thee beneath the sun—
Yea, all thy days of vanity.
For this thy only portion is in life,
And in thy weary toil which thou hast toiled beneath the sun.
10 Do then whate'er thy hand shall find in thine own might[9] to do,
For there's no work, no plan, no knowledge, no philosophy[10],
In Sheol, where thou goest.

XXIX. [6] Vaihinger, p. 124, 2d col.—[7] P. 125, 1st note. XXXI. [8] P. 126, second note.—[9] Excursus II., p. 135, 1st col.—[10] Excursus I., p. 131, 1st col.

Digitized by Google

XXXII.

Koheleth turns again—He revises and retracts what had been said—All such advice to live merrily is vain, because there is no certainty in human affairs, and human efforts—All Wisdom, therefore, and all resolving to be happy may be in vain.

Chapter IX.

11 I turned again to look beneath the sun.
Not to the swift the race I saw, nor victory to the strong,
Nor to the wise secure their bread, nor to the prudent wealth,
Nor favor to the knowing ones, but time and doom to all.
12 For man knows not his time.
Like fishes taken in the net, or like to birds ensnared,
So are the sons of Adam snared when comes the evil hour,
And falls upon them suddenly, unwarned.

XXXIII.

Koheleth gives an historical example of the little avail that wisdom is to its possessor, yet still protesting its desirableness, and its intrinsic superiority to strength and weapons of war—How sin and folly, too, may render it ineffectual, and even turn it to evil.

Chapter IX.

13 This, too, I saw, a mystery[1] great [to me] beneath the sun:
14 A little city—few its men—a monarch great invading,
With hosts surrounds, and builds against it mighty mounds of siege.
15 A man was found therein, a poor man, yet most wise.
This man the city by his wisdom saved;
Yet no one did that poor wise man remember.
16 Then said I, true it is, that wisdom's more than strength;
Yet see—the poor man's wisdom—how despised, his words unheard!
17 Words of the wise! in quiet are they heard
Beyond the shout of him who rules o'er fools.
18 Sure, wisdom is a better thing than instruments of war;
Though all its good so great one sinner may destroy.

Chapter X.

1 Like as dead flies, with frothy taint, the fragrant oil corrupt,
So taints[2] a little folly, one for worth and wisdom famed.

XXXIV.

A series of moral meditations, having more of suggestive than of logical association—Their main drift, that men should employ their faculties in the best way they can, notwithstanding the little efficiency of human wisdom in securing good and avoiding evil.

Chapter X.

2 The wise man's heart is on his right, the fool's heart on his left.
3 Even by the way, as walks the fool, his understanding fails,
And unto every one he meets, his folly he proclaims.
4 If e'er against thee swell the ruler's rage, leave not thy place;
Though great the offence, the yielding spirit calms.
5 Another evil have I seen beneath the sun:
An error such as comes from princes' favor;
6 Folly is set on high, the rich sit lowly on the ground.
7 Servants on horses mounted have I seen;—
Princes, like servants, walking on the earth.

XXXIII. [1] P. 127, note.—[2] P. 138, note.

Digitized by Google

XXXV.

There is danger, too, in the ordinary avocations of life.

CHAPTER X.

8 Who digs a ditch himself may fall therein.
Who breaks a hedge, a serpent there may bite him.
9 He who removeth stones, gets hurt thereby,
Who cleaveth trees, by them is put in peril.
10 If dull the iron, and its edge he fails to sharpen well,
Then greater force he needs,[3] and help of wise dexterity.

XXXVI.

The babbler—Speech of the wise—Of the foolish—Vain predictions.

CHAPTER X.

11 A serpent that without enchantment bites—
So is the slanderer's tongue; no gain hath it to its possessor.
12 Words of the wise man's mouth,—they're words of grace;
Lips of the fool,—the fool himself they swallow up;
13 His words in folly that began, in raving madness end.
14 Predicting[4] words he multiplies; yet man can never know,
The thing that shall be, yea, what cometh after who shall tell?
15 Vain toil of fools! it wearieth him,—this man that knoweth naught
That may befall his going to the city.[5]

XXXVII.

Evils of bad government—A blessing on the well-ruled State—Evils of slothfulness—The feast for joy—But money answers all—Revile not the powerful, or the rich.

CHAPTER X.

16 Woe unto thee, O land,—thy king a child,—
Thy nobles rising early to the feast.
17 Blessed art thou, O land,—thy king the son of princely sires,—
Thy nobles timely in their feasts, for strength,—not revelry.
18 Through slothfulness the building goes to ruin;
When hands hang down, the house lets[6] in the rain.
19 For mirth do men prepare the feast, and wine to gladden life;
But money is the power that answers all.
20 Not even in thy thought revile the king,
Nor in thy chamber, dare to curse the rich;
The bird of heaven shall carry forth the sound;
The swift of wing the secret word reveal.

XXXVIII.

Be boldly liberal—Let nature have its course—But do thy present duty—The Spirit's mysterious way—The secret of life known only to God—Be diligent and leave the issue to God—Life is sweet, but remember the day of darkness.

CHAPTER XI.

1 Upon the waters boldly cast thy bread;
For thou shalt find it after many days.
2 To seven a portion give, yea, more, to eight;
Thou knowest not what evil may be coming on the land.
3 If clouds be full of rain, they pour it on the earth.
Whether to North, or South the tree shall fall,
Where'er it falls, there shall it surely lie.

XXXV. [3] P. 140. XXXVI. [4] P. 141, note.—[5] Pp. 141, 142, note. XXXVII. [6] P. 143, second col.

Digitized by Google

4 He who observes the wind shall never sow.
Who gazes on the clouds shall never reap.
5 'Tis like the spirit's way;[7] thou knowest it not;
Or how the bones do grow within the pregnant womb;
Even so thou knowest not the way of God,
Who worketh all.

6 Then in the morning sow thy seed;
Nor yet at evening stay thy hand.
For which shall prosper, this or that,
Or both alike shall profit bring,
Lies all beyond thy ken.

7 Sweet is the light, and pleasant to the eye to see the sun.
8 Yet if a man live many years, rejoicing in them all,[8]
The days of darkness let him not forget,
That they are many; all that cometh, still is vanity.

XXXIX.

Youth warned of Judgment—Declared to be Vanity—Early Remembrance of the Creator—Old age and its gathering Darkness—The dissolving Earthly House. Figure of the Castle with its Keepers—Its men of Might—Its Purveyors, or Grinders—Its Watchmen—Its closing Gates—Fears of old age—Its Burdens—Its Hoary Hairs—Its failing Desire—The Beth Olam, or House of Eternity—Other Figures—The Broken Lamp—The Ruined Fountain—The Flesh to Dust—The Soul to God. The closing cry of Vanity—Hebel Hebalim—"A vapor that appeareth for a little while," Jas. iv. 14.

CHAPTER XI.

9 Rejoice O youth in childhood; let thy heart
Still cheer thee in the day when thou art strong.[9]
Go on in every way thy will shall choose,
And after every form thine eyes behold:
But know that for all this thy God will thee to judgment bring.
10 O then, turn sorrow from thy soul, keep evil from thy flesh;
For childhood and the morn[10] of life, they, too, are vanity.

CHAPTER XII.

1 Remember thy Creator, then, in days when thou art young;
Before the evil days are come, before the years draw nigh;
When thou shalt say—delight in them is gone.
2 Before the sun, the morning light,[1] the moon, the stars, grow dark,
And after rain the clouds again do evermore return;
3 Before the keepers of the house do shake,
Its men of might [its strong supporters] bend,
And they who grind, in strength and numbers, fail;
When darkness falls on them who from the turret windows watch;[2]
4 And closing are the doors that lead abroad;[3]
When the hum[4] of the mill is sounding low,
Though it rise[5] to the sparrow's note,
And voices[6] loudest in the song, do all to faintness sink.

XXXVIII. [7] Excursus, p. 147.—[8] P. 151, note. XXXIX. [9] Pp. 151, 152, note.—[10] P. 152, second col.—[1] P. 154, first note—[2] P. 155, first note—[3] P. 155, second note.—[4] P. 155, third note.—[5] The same.

Digitized by Google

5 When they shall be afraid of what is high;
And terrors fill the way;
And the almond[7] tree shall bloom,
The insects' weight oppress,[8]
And all desire shall fail;
For thus man goes to his eternal house,[9]
Whilst round about the streets the mourners walk—
6 Before the silver cord shall part,[10] the golden bowl be dashed,
The bucket broken at the spring, the wheel at cistern crushed,
7 And dust goes down to earth from whence it came,
And soul returns again to Him who gave it at the first.

8 O vanity of vanities, the preacher saith,
O vanity of vanities! all—vanity.

XL.

A prose Scholium by the general author, or compiler, praising the wisdom of Koheleth, and the excellence of his doctrine, with a closing poetic extract from the Solomonic meditations, as suitable to it. This is followed by the solemn conclusion to the whole as taken from the same ancient source.

CHAPTER XII.

9 And moreover; Because the Preacher was wise,[1] he continued to teach the people know-
10 ledge. Yea, he gave an attentive ear, and sought out, and set in order, many parables. The
Preacher sought to find acceptable words, and what he wrote was upright, even words of
truth.

11 Words of the wise! like piercing goads are they;
Like driven nails their gathered[2] sentences,
All from One Shepherd given.

THE GRAND CONCLUSION.

12 Be warned, my son,—'tis only left to say—
Of making many chapters[3] there's no end;
And thinking long is wearying to the flesh.
13 The great conclusion hear:
FEAR GOD AND HIS COMMANDMENTS KEEP, FOR THIS IS ALL OF MAN.
14 For every work, yea, every secret deed,
Both good and evil, God will surely into judgment bring.

XXXIX. [7] P. 157, first note.—[8] P. 157, second note.—[9] Excursus, p. 158.—[10] P. 160, second note. **XL.** [1] Notes 165, 166.—[2] P. 165, Text Note to v. 11.—[3] P. 168, first note, and Appendix to Int., p. 30.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

THE

SONG OF SOLOMON.

BY

DR. OTTO ZÖCKLER,

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GREIFSWALD.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN, WITH ADDITIONS,

BY

W. HENRY GREEN, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF ORIENTAL AND O. T. LITERATURE IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY AT PRINCETON, N. J.

NEW YORK:

CHARLES SCRIBNER & CO., 654 BROADWAY.

1870.

Digitized by Google

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1870, by
CHARLES SCRIBNER, & CO.,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District
of New York.

JAS. B. RODGERS CO.,
ELECTROTYPERS,
52 & 54 N. Sixth St., Philadelphia.

Digitized by Google

THE

SONG OF SOLOMON.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. NAME AND ARTISTIC FORM OF THE SONG OF SOLOMON.

The title שִׁיר הַשִּׁירִים, "Song of songs," or, as it is more fully expressed in i. 1, שִׁיר הַשִּׁירִים אֲשֶׁר לִשְׁלֹמֹה "The Song of songs, which is Solomon's," describes this book neither as a "series (chain) or collection of many songs" (as KLEUKER, AUGUSTI, VELTHUSEN, PAULUS suppose), nor as one prominent among the many songs of Solomon (according to IBN EZRA's and D. KIMCHI's translation: "A song of the songs of Solomon"). "Song of songs" (Sept., ᾆσμα ᾀσμάτων; Vulg., *canticum canticorum*) is without doubt rather designed to characterize this poem as the most excellent of its kind, as the finest, the most precious of songs. Of the many songs, which, according to 1 Kings v. 12, Solomon composed, the author of this title,—whom we must at all events distinguish from the poet himself, as is shown particularly by its אֲשֶׁר instead of the poetical abbreviation שֶׁ, which is always used in the song itself*—would exalt the one before us as especially commendable and elegant. This sense, suggested by analogies like "heaven of heavens" (1 Kings viii. 27), "servant of servants" Gen. ix. 25, "vanity of vanities" (Eccles. i. 2), "ornament of ornaments" (Ezek. xvi. 7),† which LUTHER has briefly and appositely expressed by "*das Hohelied*," is undoubtedly involved in the expression, whether אֲשֶׁר לִשְׁלֹמֹה, "which is Solomon's," be referred (as is usually done) to the principal subject in the singular שִׁיר, "song," or to the immediately preceding plural הַשִּׁירִים ("Song of the songs of Solomon=the noblest among the songs of Solomon;" so, *e. g.*, HITZIG, EWALD, *Dichter des A. Bds.*, 2d edit., I., 236; BLEEK, *Einleit. in's A. T.*, 2d edit., p. 636).‡

---

* [There is no reason whatever to suspect, much less believe, that this title is of a later date than the book itself, of whose text it is without doubt a genuine and integral part. In its favor may be urged the usage of ancient writers, both sacred and profane, to preface their productions by some such brief statement of the author, theme or occasion. It stands upon the same ground with the titles to the Psalms and prophecies, whose originality has likewise been disputed, often on the most frivolous pretences, but never disproved. The correctness of this title is conceded, or is capable of being readily established. It was neither indecorous nor unnatural for the author to designate his own production as the Song of songs, if it involved the sacred mystery which all but the lowest class of erotic interpreters find in it. In the elevated diction of this Song the abbreviated and unusual form of the relative, which occurs only sporadically elsewhere, is employed exclusively throughout; but it surely need occasion no surprise that it is not found likewise in the prosaic title, as ZÖCKLER himself confesses, § 3, Rem. 2. The occurrence of אשר in Judg. v. 27 casts no suspicion on the genuineness of that verse though שׁ is used elsewhere in the song of Deborah, ver. 7. Nor, on the other hand, does a single שׁ, where אשר is, the prevailing form, discredit Gen. vi. 3 or Job xix. 29. Both forms of the relative likewise occur interchangeably in Ecclesiastes, and both are found in the writings of Jeremiah.—TR.]

† [Other superlatives of like construction are the Holy of holies, Ex. xxvi. 33; King of kings, Ezek. xxvi. 7; God of gods and Lord of lords, Deut. x. 17 (but not Josh. xxii. 22, where the original is different); see also Dan. viii. 25, Ps. lxxii. 5, comp. Rev. i. 6. The same idiom is found in the Greek of the New Testament, *e. g.*, an Hebrew of the Hebrews, Phil. iii. 5, and has even been transferred to English as in the phrase "heart of hearts."—TR.]

‡ [Rendered by COVERDALE: Ballets. In MATTHEW's Bible, CRANMER's and BISHOPS': Ballet of ballets of Solomon. WICKLIFFE and the common English version: Song of songs. DOWAY: Solomon's Canticle of canticles. GENEVA: "an excellent Song, which was Solomon's," to which is added the note "Heb. a Song of songs, so called because it is the chiefest of those thousand and five which Solomon made, 1 Kings iv. 32." PATRICK: "The most natural meaning seems to be that this is the most ex-

Digitized by Google

The unity of its contents might accordingly be inferred from this most ancient denomination of the book, traditionally preserved in the Bible. The Song of Solomon is one poem, a poetical unit artistically arranged and consistently wrought out—not a collection of many songs put together like a string of pearls (HERDER), a " delightful medley " (GOETHE), an anthology of erotic poems without mutual connection (MAGNUS), a conglomerate of "fragments thrown together in wild confusion" (LOSSNER), *etc.* All these hypotheses which issue in the chopping up of this noble work of art (with which is to be classed in the most recent times the view taken by the Reformed Jews REBENSTEIN and SANDERS, which pares away portions of ch. iii. and viii. as spurious, and carves the whole into four songs) are utterly untenable. This appears both negatively from the meaningless and formless character of the fragments, great or small, which they create, and positively from the impression of unity and inner connection which an unprejudiced and thorough study of the whole produces. That in several passages the same sentence recurs in identical words as a refrain (see particularly ii. 7; iii. 5; viii. 4); that a chorus of "daughters of Jerusalem" is addressed no less than six times, and a seventh time is mentioned in the third person (iii. 10; comp. i. 5; ii. 7; iii. 5; v. 8; v. 16; viii. 4); that the relation of a lover to his beloved runs through the whole as the prominent theme, and prevailingly in the form of a dialogue or responsive song (see especially ch. i.; ii. 1–7; ch. iv.; ch. vii. and viii.); and finally that references not only to the times of Solomon, but to his person as the principal subject of all the descriptions and amatory outpourings of the heart stand out every where over and over again (i. 4, 5; iii. 7–11; vii. 6; viii. 11, 12); these are incontrovertible criteria of the strict unity of the whole which is not to be doubted even where particular portions seem not to cohere so well together, or where it remains uncertain to which of the actors a sentence or series of sentences is to be assigned. The whole is really a שִׁיר, a song or poem, *i. e.*. not a carmen (a lyric poem, hymn or ode), to be sung with instrumental accompaniment—in which case it would have been called מִזְמוֹר rather than שִׁיר—but a poem of a more comprehensive kind and of lyrico-dramatic character, a cycle of erotic songs, possessing unity of conception, and combined in the unity of one dramatic action. Whether now it be likened to the bucolic compositions of the later Greeks, and so be esteemed a Hebrew idyl or carmen amœbæum (so HUG, HERBST and older writers before them); or a proper dramatic character be claimed for it, and on this presumption it be maintained that it was actually performed in public, being both acted and sung after the manner of an opera (BÖTTCHER, RENAN), or at least was designed for such performance (EWALD); it must at all events be maintained as scientifically established and confirmed by all the details of its poetic execution, that its plan and composition are dramatic, and consequently that the whole belongs to the dramatic branch of the Old Testament Chokmah- (חָכְמָה) literature, and is the representative of the lyrico-dramatic (melo-dramatic) poetry of the O. T., as the Book of Job is the principal specimen of the epico-dramatic (didactic dialogue). Comp. the Introduction to the Solomonic Wisdom-literature in general (in commentary on Proverbs), § 5 and 10.

REMARK 1.—Against the attempt of IBN EZRA, KIMCHI and other Rabbins to explain שִׁיר הַשִּׁירִים as meaning "a song of the songs" may be urged not only the analogy of the expressions above adduced as "heaven of heavens," *etc.*, but also the fact that this partitive sense would have to be expressed by שִׁיר מֵהַשִּׁירִים. The expression "a song of the songs of Solomon" would also have been strangely pleonastic, and have conflicted unduly with the analogy of the titles to the Psalms, which never contain more than the simple שִׁיר (or מִזְמוֹר, or שִׁיר מִזְמוֹר).—On the other hand, it makes against the interpretation: "a song of songs," *i. e.*, "a collection of several songs, a chain of songs" (KLEUKER, *Sammlung der Gedichte Salomo's, sonst das Hohelied genannt*, 1780, p. 6 f.; AUGUSTI, *Einleitung*, p. 213), that then שִׁיר would have an entirely different sense the first time from that it has the second, as though it were synonymous with the Chald. שֵׁיר, "chain," and with the corresponding Arabic word, and signified "series" (so VELTHUSEN and

cellent of all songs that Solomon made; yet the Chaldee paraphrase and abundance of Christian writers think it called the most excellent song, with respect likewise to all the songs that had been formerly made by any prophetical person, as those, Ex. xv.; Judg. v.; 1 Sam. ii., *etc.*, because *they* celebrated only some particular benefits, *this* the immense love of God, not only towards that nation, but towards all mankind." POOLE: "The most excellent of all songs, whether composed by profane or sacred authors, by Solomon or by any other."]

Digitized by Google

PAULUS, in EICHHORN'S *Repertorium* XVII., p. 109 f.).* This would the more conflict with Hebrew usage because this language has a special fondness for the combination of a noun in the singular with a dependent plural of like signification to denote the superlative. Comp. EWALD, *Lehrb.*, § 313, *c*. [GREEN'S *Heb. Gram.*, § 254, 2, *a*].—On Solomon's authorship indicated by אֲשֶׁר לִשְׁלֹמֹה comp. § 3 below.

REMARK 2.—The unity of the Song of Solomon has been repeatedly contested in recent times. HERDER ("*Lieder der Liebe, die ältesten und schönsten aus dem Morgenlande,*" 1778) was followed in this direction not only by GOETHE (in the "*Westöstlicher Divan*" at least, whilst subsequently in his "*Kunst und Alterthum*" he declared for UMBREIT'S view that the whole possessed dramatic unity), but also by most of the theological commentators and critics down to the 20th year of the present century, particularly EICHHORN, BERTHOLDT, AUGUSTI, DE WETTE, in their Introductions to the Old Test.; KLEUKER, GAAB, DÖDERLEIN, GESENIUS, PAULUS, DÖPKE, and many others. And at a still later period, after EWALD (1826), KOESTER (in PELT'S "*Theologische Mitarbeiten,*" 1839), UMBREIT ("*Erinnerung an das hohe Lied,*" 1839) and others had contended for the unity of the poem with considerable energy and success, ED. ISID. MAGNUS (*Kritische Bearbeitung und Erklärung des Hohenliedes Salomo's*, Halle, 1842) with the greatest expenditure of acuteness and learning sought to prove that the whole originated from uniting a number of erotic songs and sonnets in an anthology. This "floral collection" contains according to him fourteen complete odes besides a number of fragments, which may all but one (ii. 15, fragment of a drinking song) be combined into three longer odes, together with two later supplements to two of these 17 or 18 pieces, thus making in all twenty distinguishable constituent parts, independent from one another in origin, and produced by several different poets at various periods. The seeming microscopic exactness of this investigation of MAGNUS made an impression upon several of the later critics, notwithstanding the evidently arbitrary manner in which the separate portions of the text "are shaken up together at pleasure like the bits of colored stone in a kaleidoscope." THEOD. MUNDT, in his "*Allgem. Literaturgeschichte,*" 1849 (I., 153) considers it settled that the Song of Solomon is an anthology of disconnected popular erotic songs. E. W. LOSSNER (*Salomo und Sulamith* 1851) in his exegesis of the Song chiefly proposes to himself the task of "inventing some connection between the fragments thrown together in wild confusion." And BLEEK in his "*Einleitung in's A. T.*" (2d edit., 1865, p. 641), edited by KAMPHAUSEN, thinks that with the admission that the whole, as it now exists, proceeded from one redactor, he must connect the assumption "that it contains sundry erotic songs," songs, too, only a part of which were composed with reference to Solomon, the greater portion having "relation to persons of the condition of shepherds,† and in the country."—The interpolation-hypothesis of the two Jewish interpreters, A. REBENSTEIN and DAN. SANDERS, is likewise based upon at least a partial dissection of the poem, the former of whom, in his "*Lied der Lieder*" (1834), the latter in BUSCH'S "*Jahrbüch. der Israeliten,*" 1845, and in his little treatise lately issued, "*das Hohelied Salomonis*" (Leipzig, O. Wigand, 1866), maintain that at least chap. iii.—either the entire chapter, as REBENSTEIN imagines, or its first five verses, as SANDERS makes it—and the concluding verses viii. 8–14 are later insertions, and that the book "purged" of these alleged spurious additions contains four songs relating to Solomon's love for Shulamith and so far connected, but which are now out of their original order and somewhat divided. These four songs or sections of the "*Idyl*" are: 1) ch. i. 1–6; viii. 12; i. 7—ii. 6; 2) ch. ii. 7–17; iv. 1—v. 1; 3) ch. v. 2—vi. 10; 4) ch. iii. 6–11; vi. 11—viii. 7.

* [So GOOD: "The word שִׁיר, in the present and most other instances translated *song*, means in its original acceptation 'a string or chain;' it is precisely synonymous with the Greek *σειρα*. The different idyls presented in the collection before us were therefore probably regarded by the sacred poet, at the time of their composition, as so many distinct beads or pearls, of which the whole, when strung together, constituted one perfect שִׁיר, string, catenation or divan."]

† [GOOD regards the Song "as a collection of [12] distinct idyls upon one common subject—and that the loves of the Hebrew monarch and his fair bride. * * * The author of these exquisite amorets was King Solomon." FRY also finds in the Song "a number of distinct pieces" proceeding, it is true, from a common author, and having "some unity of design in regard of the mystic sense which they are intended to bear." But the parties described are not the same throughout. "Though King Solomon is mentioned, and his marriage processions perhaps gave occasion to some of these allegories, yet the scene is every now and then changed, and we are led to contemplate the intercourse and concerns of some rural or domestic pair in humble life." NOYES agrees substantially with FRY, but without admitting the existence of a mystical sense.—TR.]

Digitized by Google

The internal grounds for the unity and integrity of the whole, as they have been recently put together by DELITZSCH particularly ("*das Hohelied untersucht und ausgelegt*," Leipz., 1851, p. 4 ff.), following up the previous presentation of them by EWALD, UMBREIT, *etc.* (see above) are decisive against all these fragmentary and crumbling hypotheses, not to speak of the uniformity throughout of the style of the language (of which more particularly in § 4). The first five and the weightiest of these grounds are: 1) The name of Solomon runs through the whole, i. 5; iii. 7, 9, 11; viii. 11, 12; those passages also are to be included, in which he and no other is called המלך, "the king," i. 4, 12; comp. vii. 6. 2) Throughout the whole there appears in addition to the lover and his beloved a chorus of בנות ירושלים, "daughters of Jerusalem." These are addressed i. 5; ii. 7; iii. 5; v. 8, 16; viii. 4; and in iii. 10 something is said about them. This shows the sameness in the dramatic constitution of the whole. 3) Throughout the whole mention is only made of the mother of the beloved, i. 6; iii. 4; viii. 2, (5), never of her father. 4) Distinct portions of the whole begin and end with the same or similar words in the style of a refrain. A new paragraph begins three times with the question of surprise, מי זאת וגו, "Who is this," *etc.*, iii. 6; vi. 10; viii. 5; the adjuration of the daughters of Jerusalem not to waken [her] love three times forms the conclusion, ii. 6 f.; iii. 5; viii. 3 f. So the summons to the lover to spring over the mountains like a gazelle manifestly stands twice at the end of a section, ii. 17, comp. 8; and viii. 14. 5) The whole is permeated too by declarations on the part of the maiden concerning her relation to her lover which are couched in identical terms. Twice she says "My beloved is mine and I am his, who feeds among the roses," ii. 16; vi. 3; twice "I am sick of love," ii. 5; v. 8; and not only in iii. 1, 2, 3, 4, but as far back as i. 7 she calls her lover שאהבה נפשי "he whom my soul loves." Likewise the address of the chorus to the beloved runs in a uniform strain, i. 8; v. 9; vi. 1, "thou fairest among women."—The last of these arguments contains (as does also No. 1) a special refutation of REBENSTEIN's and SANDERS' objections to the genuineness or integrity of Ch. 3. What are regarded as well by these critics as by the rest of those who impugn the unity of this book, as repetitions or imitations by a later hand, are shown by a true insight into the dramatic composition of the whole to be the necessary repetition of certain characteristic formulas purposely made by the poet himself. And as well in this as in all other respects the final judgment passed by DELITZSCH, p. 6, upon the whole controversy respecting the unity and integrity of the Song of Solomon, seems to be abundantly justified: "He who has any perception whatever of the unity of a work of art in human discourse, will receive an impression of external unity from the Song of Solomon, which excludes all right to sunder any thing from it as of a heterogeneous character or belonging to different periods, and which compels to the conclusion of an internal unity, that may still remain an enigma to the Scripture exposition of the present, but must nevertheless exist." Comp. also VAIHINGER, *der Prediger und das Hohelied*, p. 258 f.

REMARK 3. In respect to the poetic and artistic form of the Song of Solomon, provided its unity is admitted, and due regard is paid to the dialogue character of the discourse, there are on the whole but two views, that can possibly be entertained, that it is an *idyl* or *bucolic carmen amœbœum*, and that it is a proper drama though with a prevailing lyric and erotic character. The former supposition was adopted by some of the older interpreters mentioned by CARPZOV, *Introd. in libros canonicos V. T.*, and after them by L. HUG ("*das Hohelied in einer noch unversuchten Deutung*," 1813, and "*Schutzschrift*" 1816), who urges in its favor the rural and pastoral character of most of the scenes and the prevalence of the same form of alternate discourse between two lovers. He has, however, remained almost alone among modern students of the Old Test. in this opinion as well as in the allegorical and political explanation of the Song connected with it, as though it were a colloquy between the ten tribes of Israel and the King of Judah. Only another catholic, HERBST (*Einleitung in's A. T.*, edited by WELTE, 1842) substantially agrees with him; and the idyllic form of the whole as a group of twelve songs or scenes is likewise maintained by A. HEILIGSTEDT in his continuation of MAURER's *Commentar. Gramm. Crit. in V. T.*, (IV. 2, 1848). The decisive consideration against this idyllic hypothesis*

* [Sir WILLIAM JONES (followed by GOOD, FRY and NOYES): *Salomonis sanctissimum carmen inter idyllia Hebræa recensendum puto.* TAYLOR entitles the several divisions of the Song "eclogues," but like BOSSUET and PERCY regards the whole as a pastoral drama.—TR.]

Digitized by Google

is the constant change of scene in the Song, the frequent transfer of the locality from the country to the city, and from Solomon's palace to Shulamith's homestead, also the repeated change of actors and the unequal length of the intervals of time between the several scenes. All these peculiarities are foreign to the nature of the idyl or pastoral poem, and agree better with the view that the Song is a proper drama. The dialogue scenes, separated in time and place, are closely connected together by their common reference to one and the same loving relation; and with a strict maintenance of the characters introduced, though without a proper plot, they visibly depict the historical progress of the relation between a royal lover and his beloved raised from an humble position to princely splendor and exaltation. No essential characteristic of dramatic composition is wanting in this poem: from beginning to end it contains conversations between two or more persons alternating with monologues or with narrations of what had been said by others; a chorus of the daughters of Jerusalem accompanies the whole progress of the action and takes part in it; the several scenes are more or less plainly separated from one another, and at certain principal points, at least, are distinguished by the recurrence of final or initial refrains. Only we must not go so far in maintaining the dramatic character of the piece as to allege with EWALD (*d. poet. Bücher des A. Bds.* 2 *Aufl.* 1866, I. 73 ff.) that it was actually designed for public representation, or even with BÖTTCHER ("*die ältesten Bühnendichtungen*," Leipz., 1850; and "*Neue exegetisch-krit. Aehrenlese*" 3. *Abtheil.* 1865, p. 76 ff.) and RENAN (*Le Cantique des Cantiques*, p. 83 ff.) that it was actually exhibited in the form of a play to be sung and accompanied by mimic acting, that is to say, in the style of the Sicilian-Dorian mimes, the Etruscan fescennines, the Campanian and old Roman fabulæ Atellanæ, *etc.* In opposition to such an exaggeration of the dramatical view into the grossly realistic, HITZIG's remark (*das Hohelied erklärt, etc.*, p. 7,) continues in force almost without limitation. "If the piece actually came upon the stage it would be necessary for a speaker, where the language of other parties was introduced into the midst of his own, to change his voice so as actually to imitate the voices of others, and not to leave this distinction to the imagination merely: but the cases occur too frequently (ii. 10–15; v. 2, 3; vi. 10; vii. 1,) and the matter appears quite too complicated for this to be credible. The author would also assume the place of the chorus, and take part himself in the play; v. 1 *b*, (??—see against this improbable view § 2, Remark 1, p. 8); but then the piece also ceases to be objective to him, *i. e.*, to be a drama to him. The poem certainly has a dramatic structure; but ii. 8 already proves that the author has not the power to continue in so objective an attitude, and he slides into the more convenient path of description and narration. The action is often hidden behind an imperfect dialogue; and this is easily superseded by a prolonged discourse requiring no answer; or if one is made, it is slim and scanty (vii. 11; iv. 16). Finally one may well ask, if the piece were actually performed, what would be its moral effect, which must have been foreseen, and therefore intended? Would not vii. 2–10 represented on the stage have transferred the illicit desires * of the speaker to the soul of the spectators? How could the sensuality of the auditor excited by iv. 9, 10, 12 ff., be prevented from taking fire even in an extra-nuptial direction? The Song of Solomon is a drama which the poet saw in the spirit, as the apocalyptic (prophets) Daniel and John had a series of scenes pass before their spiritual eye."—DELITZSCH, too, emphasizes in opposition to BÖTTCHER's view of the mimic performance of the Song of Solomon in the form of a rude and "unenviable" stage play of the times of the Israelitish kings, the ideal character of its artistic and dramatic form, and the morally pure and elevated spirit which it manifestly breathes from beginning to end. He puts it, herein following the lead of LOWTH (*de sacra poesi Hebr. præl.* 30 ff., and EWALD (*Poet. B.*, 1st. edit., I. 40 ff., Comp. 2d edit., I. 73) as a representative of the sacred comedy of the Old Test., beside the book of Job as the chief product of the tragic art of the O. T. people of God. This designation may be allowed to pass as appropriate in the general, and not liable to be misunderstood. Nevertheless the essential character of the artistic form employed in this composition seems to be more accurately designated by the expression "melodrama" (v. AMMON) or lyrico-dramatic poetry, inasmuch as the relation of this form to that of the book of Job (as the epico-dramatic, or didactic-dramatic) is thus not only strikingly brought out, but also those defects and imperfections pointed

* [These belong to his own sensual interpretation, not to the Song itself.—TR.]

Digitized by Google

out in the passage cited above from HITZIG in the carrying out of the dramatic form, which is often exchanged for the purely lyric, are thus accounted for.

§ 2. CONTENTS AND DIVISIONS (CONSTITUTION) OF THE SONG OF SOLOMON.

The Song of Solomon begins with a responsive Song between the chorus of the daughters of Jerusalem and Shulamith, a simple country maid from Shulem or Shunem * in the north of Palestine (see vii. 1) who, for her beauty, was chosen by Solomon to be his bride, and brought to the royal palace in Jerusalem. With plain and lovely discourse, corresponding to the artless disposition of an unspoiled child of nature, she avows both her ardent love for her royal bridegroom, and her longing for her native fields, whose spicy freshness and simpler style of life she prefers to the haughty splendor of court life, and especially to being associated with the great number of ladies in the royal palace (these are the daughters of Jerusalem), i. 2–8. These feelings of love and of home-sickness which simultaneously assail her heart, she hereupon expresses likewise to Solomon himself, with whom, after the exit of the chorus of those ladies, she is left alone in the "house of wine," one of the inmost rooms of the palace, i. 9—ii. 7.—Returned to her country home (and this, it would appear, with the approval of her royal lover), she finds herself still more ardently in love with him, and reveals her longing for a union with him ii. 8—iii. 5, by relating two episodes from the previous history of their love, *viz.*, their first meeting (ii. 9–14) and a subsequent search for him, and finding him again (iii. 1–4).—Not long after the king really comes out for her, and has her brought home with great pomp and princely honors as his royal spouse. Her festive entry into the royal palace excites the admiring curiosity, astonishment, and enthusiasm of the inhabitants of Jerusalem (iii. 6–11). The cordial love, which her newly married husband shows her, makes her forget her home-sickness, and causes her to enter with her whole heart into the rapturous rejoicings of the wedding feast (iv. 1—v. 1). But the heaven of her happiness is soon darkened anew. A distressing dream (v. 2–7) mirrors to her the loss, nay the desertion of her husband; and soon after the way in which he mentions his numerous concubines, with whom she is to share his love (vi. 8), in the midst of his caresses and flattering speeches (vi. 4–9) shows her that she can never feel happy in the voluptuous whirl of his court life already degenerated into the impure. Hence her longing for the quiet and innocent simplicity of her rural home is awakened more strongly than ever before, and drives her to entreat her lover to remove thither with her altogether, that as at once a husband and a brother, he may belong exclusively to her (v. 2—viii. 4). Overcome by her charms and loveliness, Solomon yields and grants her her humble request to become a plain shepherdess and vinedresser again, instead of a queen surrounded by pomp and splendor. He even takes part in the merry sport and innocent raillery with which she pleases herself in her old accustomed way in the circle of her brothers and sister (one little sister and several grown up brothers), and joins in the spirited encomium upon the all-conquering and even death-exceeding power of wedded love and fidelity (viii. 6–8), by which, with a thankful heart, she celebrates her return home (viii. 5–14).

This simple action, almost entirely free from exciting complications and contrasts, is divided by the poet into five acts, of which the next to the last (v. 2—viii. 4) is in striking contrast with the rest from its disproportionate length, but yet cannot well be divided into two, because no proper point of division can be found either at vi. 9, 10, or at vii. 1. Instead of the number six, maintained by DELITZSCH, we shall, therefore, with EWALD, BÖTTCHER and others have to affirm the existence of five principal scenes or sections of the piece. And in substantial adherence to the only correct view of the aim and constitution of the whole as given by DELITZSCH, we shall have to assign the following characteristic titles or statements of contents to these five acts:—1) Chap. i. 2—ii. 7. The first time the lovers were together at the royal palace in (or near) Jerusalem. 2) Chap. ii. 8—iii. 5. The first meeting of the lovers, related by Shulamith, who has returned to her home. 3) Chap. iii. 6—v. 1. The solemn bringing of the bride, and the marriage at Jerusalem. 4) Chap. v. 2—viii. 4. Shulamith's longing reawakened for her

* The identity of these two forms of the name is already vouched for by EUSEBIUS, *Onomast.* s. v. Σουλήμ, comp. EWALD, *Lehrb.* § 156, *c*, [GESEN. *Lex.* under the letter ל].

Digitized by Google

home. 5) chap. viii. 5-14. The return home and the triumph of the chaste love of the wife over the unchaste feelings of her royal husband.*

REMARK 1. According to the ordinary erotic and historical interpretation of the Song of Solomon, as it has been developed particularly by UMBREIT, EWALD, HITZIG, VAIHINGER and RENAN, after the previous suggestions of JACOBI, AMMON, STÄUDLIN, *etc.*, (comp. § 6) Shulamith is in love not with Solomon, but with a young shepherd of her country home, from whom the wanton king, after getting her in his harem by force or fraud (i. 4; comp. vi. 11, 12) seeks to alienate her by all sorts of inducements and seductive arts. But the maid, by her pure love to her quondam playmate, resists all the enticements which the king brings to bear upon her, partly through the medium of the ladies of his court, and partly in person by his own flattering speeches and several times by direct and violent assaults upon her virtue (*e. g.*, iv. 9 ff.; vii. 2-10). Convinced of the fidelity of her devotion to her distant lover Solomon is at length obliged to dismiss her to her home, whither according to STÄUDLIN, RENAN and HITZIG she is taken by her affianced, who has meanwhile hastened to her on the wings of love (vii. 12 ff.—?), whilst UMBREIT, EWALD and others prefer to leave it undecided how she returned from Jerusalem to Shulem, and conceive of her in viii. 5 ff. as suddenly and in some unexplained way transported again to the environs of her home and to the side of her lover.—This view, according to which the whole is to be regarded as a "tribute of praise to an innocence which withstands every allurement," as a "song of praise to a pure, guileless, faithful love, which no splendor can dazzle, and no flattery ensnare" (EWALD), seems to be chiefly favored by some expressions of Shulamith in chap. i., as well as here and there in what follows, which at first sight have the look of passionate exclamations to her distant lover; so particularly i. 4, "Draw me after thee, then we will run," and i. 7, "O tell me, thou whom my soul loveth, where feedest thou?" *etc.* Comp. also iv. 16; v. 10; vi. 2, *etc.* But everything is much simpler both in these passages and generally in the whole poem, if Shulamith's avowals of love are in all cases referred to the king himself, and accordingly the object of her longing as expressed, *e. g.*, in i. 6 f.; ii. 1, 3 ff.; vi. 11, 12; vii. 12 ff., is conceived to be not an absent lover, but only the peaceful quiet and beauty of her country home. This ardent longing, or rather the childlike simplicity and humility which are at the bottom of it, lead her to think of her royal lover himself as though he were a shepherd of her native fields, and to describe all his acts and movements, his plans and occupations, by expressions drawn

* [We cannot but concede to this scheme the praise of great ingenuity, particularly in the form originally proposed by DELITZSCH, which was free from some of the objections that lie against it as modified by ZÖCKLER. And yet it cannot have escaped attention that the uniting links are throughout supplied by the interpreter and not found in the Song itself. It is at best but a plausible hypothesis, and it only requires the application of like ingenuity to devise any number of others materially differing from it, yet equally entitled to regard. The story suggested above is, after all, only a romance of the modern commentator with the elements of the Song woven in to suit his convenience or his taste.

There would be no serious objection, perhaps, to this or any other fanciful combination of the statements or intimations of the poem, if it were not for the bias it creates in the mind of the interpreter, however unconscious he may be of it, and the temptation to which it subjects him to explain every thing in harmony with his preconceived scheme. The return home between ii. 7 and 8, the marriage ceremony between chap. iii. and iv., the desire to return home in vii. 11, *etc.*, *etc.*, must all be supplied. That the temporary interruption of the loving relation between the bridegroom and his bride was due to the inconstancy of the former (one of the modifications by ZÖCKLER, which is certainly not an improvement) is not only purely imaginary, but at variance with the evident suggestions of the book, *e. g.*, v. 3, and leads to a distortion of its whole idea. What is figurative in the Song, and what is literal in its primary application, is also determined mainly by the exigencies of the scheme with which the interpreter sets out. Thus ZÖCKLER, who views the bride as a country maiden, insists on the strict literality of all that is said of her rural occupations or pleasures, while admitting that the pastoral employments of the king i. 7 are only figurative, and explains away the statement vii. 1 that she is a prince's daughter. They, who identify the bride with the daughter of Pharaoh, urge the literality of vii. 1, and convert her vineyard, *etc.*, into figures. WITHINGTON in favor of his notion that she is a Sheikh's daughter and bred in rural life, claims that there is no figure in either case, since both may be adjusted in their literal sense in his hypothesis.

The numerous and persistent attempts to discover a regular plot or a consecutive story in the Song of Solomon, have thus far failed so signally, that the words of THRUPP in the present state of the question at least, seem to be justified: "It is indeed only by constraint that the Song can be viewed as a drama conforming to the rules of outward dramatic unity." It is one continuous composition, preserving throughout the same theme, the love of king Solomon and his bride, the image of a divine and spiritual love. But the scenes portrayed and the displays of mutual fondness indulged seem to be grouped rather than linked. They stand forth in their distinctness as exquisitely beautiful and reflecting as much light on each other and on the subject which they illustrate and adorn, as though they had been gathered up into the artificial unity of a consecutive narration or a dramatic plot. And this looser method of arrangement or aggregation with its abrupt transitions and sudden changes of scene, is no less graceful and impressive, while it is more in harmony with the oriental mind and style of composition generally, than the rigorous, external and formal concatenation which the more logical but less fervid Indo-European is prone to demand.—TR.]

Digitized by Google

from rural and pastoral life (see i. 7, 13, 14, 17; ii. 3 ff., 8 ff., 16 f.; v. 10 ff.; vi. 2 f.). She continues this until her eager desires are finally granted, and her royal lover, vanquished by the power and sincerity of her love, follows her to her quiet home, leaving all the luxurious splendor and voluptuousness of his court in order to live as a shepherd among shepherds, and "like a roe or a young hart on the mountains of spices" (viii. 14) to participate in the innocent amusements of Shulamith and her brothers and sister. This happy decision is brought about mainly by the glowing earnestness of Shulamith's language in vii. 10 ff., in which her love for Solomon and her homesickness are both most strongly and most movingly expressed. Several things in this address of hers are unaccountable upon any other view of the whole than that which is here presented, especially the wish "O that thou wert to me as a brother," *etc.* (viii. 1), and likewise the exhortation "Come my beloved, let us go into the country," *etc.* (vii. 12). And many previous expressions of Shulamith, as i. 12; ii. 4; iv. 16, testify, with a clearness not to be mistaken, her loving consent to Solomon's suit, and therefore cannot without forcing be reconciled with the ordinary profane-erotic explanation. It must in particular be regarded as extremely forced when EWALD regards the passage iv. 8—v. 1 as a monologue of Shulamith in which she describes the plighted love of her distant lover, while nothing is clearer than that the familiar colloquy of the bridal pair on their wedding day, which begins with iv. 1, is continued in this section, (comp. DELITZSCH, p. 33 f.). Several of the assumptions, by which HITZIG tries to bolster up his peculiar modifications of the profane-erotic interpretation are quite as arbitrary, *e. g.* the assertion that ii. 7; iii. 5; viii. 4, is the language not of Shulamith but of the poet, who here undertakes to perform the part of the chorus, addressed to the "daughters of Jerusalem" just as in v. 1 *b* also the poet "puts himself forward" (! ?); the intolerable harshness of regarding vi. 8 as an expression of the vexation at the coy beauty, with which Solomon turns away from her and back again to the ladies of his court who are ready for every kind of indulgence; the opinion that in vii. 2-10 Solomon makes a declaration of love not to Shulamith, but to some one of his concubines, and that in a vulgar and indecent way; the assumption that Shulamith's country lover was present in Jerusalem, not only from vii. 11, but from iv. 6 onward, and was engaged in the business of taking his affianced home from the royal harem, *etc.* RENAN, who follows HITZIG in the main has endeavored to extend some of these assumptions in a peculiar way, *e. g.*, by the assertion that the shepherd beloved by Shulamith, and who hastens to release her from the royal harem, already comes upon the scene in ii. 2; by the romantic idea that the same languishing shepherd utters the words iv. 8-15 "at the foot of the tower of the Seraglio," in which his beloved is confined, is then (iv. 16) admitted by her and enraptured exclaims to the chorus the words v. 1 *b.*; by the fantastic assumption that when finally released she is carried home asleep by her lover, and laid under an apple tree, where she then viii. 5 f., awakes, *etc.* The like, only in some respects more whimsical in BÖTTCHER, *die ältesten Bühnendichtungen, etc.* The wide divergence between these leading advocates of the view which we are opposing, and that in so many and by no means unimportant particulars, must give rise to misgivings with regard to the tenability of that fundamental conception which they have in common. Numerous other discrepancies between them as well as between the critics most nearly akin to them will meet us in the course of the detailed exegesis, and will confirm from the most diverse quarters the impossibility of carrying consistently through the hypothesis of two rival lovers of Shulamith in any of its phases.* The view advocated by us cannot, it is true, attain to absolute certainty, such as

* [THRUPP thus exposes the want of agreement among the advocates of this extraordinary hypothesis: "We find that the passage i. 15 is assigned by GINSBURG to the shepherd, by HITZIG and RENAN to Solomon; ii. 2 is assigned by GINSBURG and RENAN to the shepherd, but by HITZIG to Solomon; GINSBURG makes the shepherd the speaker in iv. 1-6, and ver. 7 to middle of 16, with part of v. 1, but RENAN gives iv. 1-7 to Solomon, the remainder of the above to the shepherd, while HITZIG gives iv. 1-5, 7, 9, 10, 12, *etc.*, to Solomon, 6, 8, 11 to the shepherd; vi. 8 is given to Solomon by GINSBURG and HITZIG but to the shepherd by RENAN; vi. 9 is given to Solomon by GINSBURG, but to the shepherd by HITZIG and RENAN. How little value is attached by GINSBURG himself to his own argument may be gathered from the circumstance that whereas he assigns iv. 1-5 to the shepherd, he yet, when this passage is partially repeated in vi. 5-7; vii. 3, puts the identical words into the mouth of Solomon. It is clear that he sees no fundamental difference in the language which his two male characters use. And it is not pretended that they ever address each other; nor indeed is there a single passage in which, according to any probable interpretation, they are both addressed or spoken of together. The distinction between them is in fact purely fictitious; there is but one male character in the song, the true beloved."

In regard to the introduction of new and imaginary speakers, which has been carried to such extravagant excess by HITZIG, the same able writer pertinently remarks: "It is evident that sufficient ingenuity might make a complicated

Digitized by Google

shall be perfectly satisfactory in all respects, because the absence of titles to the several acts, as well as to the parts of each particular person, makes a reliable distribution of the action amongst the several parties impossible in many cases; and because, unfortunately, no old and credible accounts of the original meaning and origin of the poem, that is to say no correct explanatory scholia are in existence. Thus much, however, can be established with a high degree of probability that among the various historical explanations of this drama that which is here attempted by us as a modification of that of DELITZSCH harmonizes particularly well at once with the contents of the piece ascertained in an unprejudiced manner, and with its composition by Solomon, which is attested by tradition and by internal considerations; on which account it is to be preferred to the historical explanation of v. HOFMANN, which is kindred to it in many respects. (He identifies the bride of the song with Pharaoh's daughter,* celebrated in Ps. xlv., and takes the poem to be a celebration of the marriage of Solomon and this Egyptian princess, moving in figures drawn from the life of shepherds and vintagers). See further particulars concerning and in opposition to this exposition of HOFMANN in DELITZSCH, p. 37 ff.; and comp. § 4 below.

REMARK 2.—The opinions of different interpreters also diverge considerably in respect to the limits of the several scenes and acts or songs, whilst the piece itself does not furnish certain criteria enough to verify either one view or another. Most of the recent writers agree in assuming about ten or twelve scenes; but less unanimity prevails in regard to the question how these shorter scenes are to be apportioned among the larger acts, and how many such acts are to be assumed. HITZIG altogether despairs of reducing the nine "scenes" affirmed by him to a smaller number of acts. DELITZSCH, HAHN, and WEISSBACH number six acts with two scenes each. EWALD (after giving up the assumption of four acts previously maintained in his commentary of 1826) and with him BÖTTCHER, RENAN, VAIHINGER and many others make five acts among which they variously distribute the thirteen to fifteen scenes which they assume. E. F. FRIEDRICH reckons four acts with ten scenes. And finally VON HOFMANN assumes but three principal divisions of about the same length (i. 2—iii. 5; iii. 6—v. 16; vi. 1—viii. 12) to which he supposes a brief conclusion of but two verses (viii. 13, 14) to be appended. The assumption of five acts might be recommended in the general by the consideration that the action of any drama by a sort of necessity passes through five main steps or stages in its progress to its consummation; whence we see Greek dramas invariably, and the old Indian at least prevailingly divided into that number of acts, and the dialogue portion of the book of Job, the other chief product of the dramatic art in the Old Testament besides the Song of Solomon, is most clearly separated into five divisions (comp. EWALD, *d. Dichter d. A. Bds.*, I. 69; DELITZSCH, *d. B., Job*, p. 12, in the "*Bibl. Commentar.*" by KEIL and DEL.). To this may be added that judging by the quintuple division of the Song of Solomon found in some old Ethiopic versions, the Sept. which is at the basis of these versions would seem to have divided the book into that number of sections (EWALD, *Bibl. Jahrb.*, 1849, p. 49), and that exegetical tradition, in so far as it gives manifold testimony even in the patristic period (*e. g.*, ORIGEN, JEROME) to the dramatic character of this piece, likewise confirms, though indirectly, its separation into the five customary divisions of every drama. Against the assumption made by DELITZSCH and HAHN of six acts may be further urged in particular that the assertion on which it is based that the larger act v. 2—viii. 4 is plainly divided into two acts by the recurrence in vi. 10 of the admiring question מי זאת וגו from iii. 6 is certainly unfounded, because this question is here manifestly only a statement of

cross-dialogue of this kind out of almost anything; each difficulty that might arise, would only require at most one additional complication, or one additional speaker." Nevertheless this extreme is a natural sequence of the method adopted. If the lover may be divided into two, why not the beloved, and why may not each resulting character be subdivided again, a process which must very soon furnish, and in fact in HITZIG'S and RENAN'S hands may be regarded as having already furnished its own *reductio ad absurdum*.—TR.].

* [This idea has been a favorite one with English Commentators. The book bears this heading in Matthew's Bible: "Solomon made this ballad or song by himself and his wife the daughter of Pharaoh, under the shadow of himself figuring Christ and under the person of his wife the church." And among the more recent expositors, WORDSW.: "It is probable that the marriage of Solomon with Pharaoh's daughter may have given occasion to the composition of the forty-fifth Psalm and also of the Canticles." So HARMER (Outlines, p. 27 ff.), LIGHTFOOT (Chronology of Old Test. in his Works, I. p. 76), TAYLOR (Fragments appended to Calmet, No. 345 ff.) and with more or less confidence many others. It is expressly controverted by GILL (who finds a chronological difficulty in vii. 4, comp. 1 Kin. vi. 38; vii. 1, 2), PERCY (who argues from iii. 4, 10; viii. 2, 8, 12), THRUPP, WEISS, (who urges the incongruities of the literal hypothesis generally, and especially i. 5, 6; iv. 8; v. 2, *etc.*), MOODY STUART (who adds to the preceding i. 7, 14; vii. 4) and others.—TR.].

Digitized by Google

what was thought and said by the women mentioned in the preceding verse, and is therefore most closely connected with ver. 9, as this with ver. 8 of the same chapter (comp. the exeget. explanations in loc.). A separation of what is certainly a disproportionately long section v. 2—viii. 4, into two or more of similar size seems on the whole to be impracticable on account of the uniformity and continuity of its contents, and we shall for this reason have to assume that the five acts enumerated above in the text of this section are probably the original ones; especially as there can be no doubt of the correctness of the points of division assumed by DELITZSCH in substantial agreement with EWALD (ii. 7; iii. 5; viii. 4—in each case the well known refrain: "I adjure you, ye daughters of Jerusalem," *etc.*). We differ in this division from EWALD and BÖTTCHER only in that we make the third act end with v. 1, because EWALD's assertion that this characteristic concluding verse "I adjure you, *etc.*," has been dropped after v. 8, cannot be proved, and the attaching of v. 2-7 to the third act appears on the whole inappropriate (as was also seen by RENAN). Our division is distinguished from that of RENAN by the different compass which it assigns to the last two acts, of which the fourth extends according to him from v. 2 to vi. 3, the fifth from vi. 3 to viii. 7, and finally viii. 8–14 is a small appendix or epilogue—all this in virtue of the strangest and most forced assumptions, which will be remarked upon as far as is necessary in the detailed interpretation. On the compass and limits of the scenes, into which the five acts are again divided, we shall have to treat in connection with the detailed exegesis.*

* [GOOD, FRY, and NOYES, who adopt the idyllic hypothesis divide the book as follows, *viz:*

GOOD.

IDYL
1. i. 2-8 Royal bride, attendant virgins.
2. i. 9—ii. 7 King Soloman, Royal bride.
3. ii. 8-17 Royal bride.
4. iii. 1-5 Royal bride.
5. iii. 6—iv. 7 Royal bride, attendant virgins, king Soloman.
6. iv. 8—v. 1 King Soloman, royal bride.
7. v. 2—vi. 10 Royal bride, attendant virgins, king Soloman.
8. vi. 11-13 Royal bride, attendant virgins.
9. vii. 1—9 Royal bride, attendant virgins, king Soloman.
10. vii. 10—viii. 4 Royal bride.
11. viii. 5-7 Virgins, royal bride, king Soloman.
12. viii. 8-14 Royal bride, king Soloman.

FRY.

IDYL OR PARABLE
1. i. 2-6 A bride from a low station conducted to the house of the king.
2. i. 7, 8 Shepherd and shepherdess.
3. i. 9—ii. 7 Royal bride and bridegroom.
4. ii. 8-17 Lovers in the country, residing at a distance.
5. iii. 1-5 Scene from humble life in the city.
6. iii. 6-11 Marriage procession of the king.
7. iv. 1—v. 1 A lover to his affianced.
8. v. 2—vi. 1 A domestic occurrence in humble life (in two parts).
9. vi. 2-10 A bride rehearsing the language of her husband.
10. vi. 11—vii. 9 A bride in a garden with a company of women.
11. vii. 10—viii. 4 A bride invites her husband to the country.
12. viii. 5-14 A married pair contemplated and overheard.

NOYES.

IDYL
1. i. 2-8 An innocent country maiden accompanied by virgins is anxious to see her lover.
2. i. 9—ii. 7 Conversation between a lover and maiden.
3. ii. 8-17 The maiden's meeting with her lover in a vineyard.
4. iii. 1-5 The maiden's search for her lover.
5. iii. 6-11 The conducting of a spouse of Solomon to his palace.
6. iv. 1—v. 1 Conversation between a lover and maiden.
7. v. 2—vi. 3 The maiden's search for her lover by night, and praise of his beauty.
8. vi. 4-9 The lover's praise of the object of his attachment.
9. vi. 10—viii. 4 Conversation between a lover and maiden.
10. viii. 5-7 Chorus of virgins, maiden and lover.
11. viii. 8-12 A conversation of two brothers about their sister, with her remarks.
12. viii. 13, 14 The lover sent away. A fragment.

BOSSUET suggested the idea that successive portions of the Song of Solomon were designed to be sung on each of the sev-

§ 3.—DATE AND AUTHOR OF THE SONG OF SOLOMON.

That Canticles was composed in the age of Solomon as the flourishing period of the Old Testament Chokmah-literature may be argued not only from manifold indications of the affinity between its ethical tendency and view of the world and those of Solomon's collection of proverbs, but chiefly from the certainty with which its author deals with all that is connected with the history of the Solomonic period; the exuberant prosperity and the abundance of native and foreign commodities whose existence he assumes in Israel at that time, and the remarkably rich round of figures and comparisons from nature which is everywhere at his command in his descriptions. And that this author is no other than Solomon himself is shown by the extensive knowledge which he exhibits throughout the entire poem of remarkable and rare objects from all of the three kingdoms of nature, and by which he may be most unmistakably recognized as that wise and well-informed king, who was able to speak "of trees from the cedar tree that is in Lebanon even unto the hyssop that springeth out of the wall; also of beasts and of fowl and of creeping things and of fishes," 1 Kin. v. 13 (iv. 33). Solomon's authorship is likewise confirmed by the equal acquaintance which the poet shows with all parts of the land of Israel; the easy and familiar way, indicating not only accurate knowledge but royal possession and ownership, in which he speaks of horses in Pharaoh's chariot (i. 9), of wood from Lebanon (iii. 9), of

en days, during which the marriage festival lasted. PERCY, WILLIAMS, and TAYLOR (in fragments to CALMET'S Dictionary of the Bible) base their divisions of the book on this conception. Thus:

	BOSSUET.	PERCY.
1st Day	i. 2—ii. 6	i. 2—ii. 7.
2d Day	ii. 7-17	ii. 8—iii. 5.
3d Day	iii. 1—v. 1	iii. 6—iv. 7.
4th Day	v. 2—vi. 9	iv. 8—v. 1.
5th Day	vi. 10—vii. 11	v. 2—vi. 10.
6th Day	vii. 12—viii. 3	vi. 11—viii. 4.
7th Day	viii. 4-14	viii. 5-14.

WILLIAMS.

	morning	evening
1st Day	i. 2-8	i. 9-14
2d Day	i. 15—ii. 7	ii. 8-17.
3d Day	iii. 1-5	iii. 6-11.
4th Day	iv. 1-6	iv. 7—v. 1.
5th Day	v. 2—vi. 3	vi. 4-13.
6th Day	vii. 1-10	vii. 11—viii. 4.
7th Day	viii. 5-7	viii. 8-14.

TAYLOR supposes the several "eclogues" to be sung on six days, and before the marriage ceremony instead of after it. He divided the book thus:

	morning	evening
1st Day	i. 2-8	i. 9—ii. 7.
2d Day	ii. 8-17	iii. 1-5.
3d Day	iii. 6—iv. 6	iv. 7—v. 1.
4th Day	v. 2—vi. 3	vi. 4-13.
5th Day	vii. 1-5	vii. 6—viii. 4.
6th Day	(after the marriage ceremony)	viii. 5-14.

MOODY STUART divides the book as is done by ZÖCKLER, but entitles the sections differently:

CANTICLE I. i. 2—ii. 7 The bride seeking and finding the king.
II. ii. 8—iii. 5 The sleeping bride awakened.
III. iii. 6—v. 1 The bridegroom with the bride.
IV. v. 2—viii. 4 The bridegroom's withdrawal and reappearance, and the bride's glory.
V. viii. 5-14 The little sister.

DAVIDSON and GINSBURG, adherents of the shepherd-hypothesis, follow the same division.

THRUPP adopts substantially the same, only subdividing the fourth and last sections, thus

1. i. 2—ii. 7 The anticipation.
2. ii. 8—iii. 5 The awaiting.
3. iii. 6—v. 1 The espousal and its results.
4. v. 2-8 The absence.
5. v. 9—viii. 4 The presence.
6. viii. 5-12 Love's triumph.
   viii. 13, 14 Conclusion.

Digitized by Google

the tower in Lebanon looking toward Damascus (vii. 5), of the pools of Heshbon and the forests of Carmel (vii. 5, 6), the tents of Kedar and the mountains of Gilead (i. 5; iv. 1), of the beauty of Tirzah and the loveliness of Jerusalem (vi. 4; comp. iv. 4), *etc.* The peculiarities in the language of the poem, rightly estimated, likewise testify rather in favor of than against Solomon's authorship. For the Aramæisms and apparent traces of later usage, which it presents, are, like similar phenomena in the Song of Deborah, in the Book of Job, in the prophet Amos, *etc.*, to be attributed entirely to its highly poetical character. And the occurrence in individual cases of foreign non-Semitic words (*e. g.* פַּרְדֵּס iv. 13, אַפִּרְיוֹן iii. 9), if this were actually proven, would be least surprising in a writer of such many-sided learning and of so universal a turn of mind as Solomon. And finally the contents of the piece are of such a nature as not only to admit but actually to favor the supposition that Solomon is the author, provided that in ascertaining these contents we discard the common assumption of the profane-erotic exegesis that this king is introduced as the seducer of the innocence of a country maid who adheres with steadfast fidelity to her betrothed. For the fundamental thought set forth above (§ 2, p. 6) in opposition thereto, of a purifying influence proceeding from Shulamith's devoted love upon the heart of the king, already partly tainted by the sensuality of polygamy and the voluptuous manners of the harem, harmonizes very well with the reference of the poem to Solomon;* especially as the mention of the sixty queens and the eighty concubines compared with the numbers stated in 1 Kings xi. 3 as belonging to his later years, seven hundred queens and three hundred concubines, points to an earlier period in the life of this king as the date of the poem, a time when his many wives had not yet ensnared his heart in unhallowed passion, nor "turned him away after strange gods" to the extent that this took place shortly before his death, 1 Kings xi. 4. It is, therefore, Solomon, when he had not yet sunk to the lowest stage of polygamous and idolatrous degeneracy, but was still relatively pure, and at any rate was still in full possession of his rich poetic productivity 1 Kings v. 12 (iv. 32) whom we must suppose to have been the author of this incomparably beautiful and graceful lyrico-dramatic work of art, in which he on the one hand extols the virtue of his charming wife, and on the other humbly confesses his own resistance at first to the purifying influence proceeding from her.

On this view, therefore, the statement of the title (i. 1), which, though post-Solomonic [?], is yet very ancient and certainly prior to the closing of the Canon, is justified as perfectly true historically; and it is unnecessary, for the sake of setting aside the direct Solomonic origin of the poem, to give to לִשְׁלֹמֹה, in violation of the laws of the language and of the constant usage of לְ in the superscriptions to the Psalms, the explanation, "in reference to Solomon," or "in the style of Solomon." to which *e. g.* UMBREIT, following the lead of some older commentators like COCCEIUS, shows himself inclined (perhaps also the Septuag. with its translation: *Ἆισμα ᾀσμάτων, ὅ ἐστιν τῷ Σαλωμών*).†

WEISS, according to his historico-prophetic scheme, divides the book into three parts, as related to three successive divine manifestations, together with a conclusion, thus:

1. i. 2—ii. 7 The dedication of the tabernacle.
2. ii. 8—iii. 5 The dedication of Solomon's temple.
3. iii. 6—viii. 4 The advent of Christ.

viii. 5–14 Conclusion.

BURROWES also divides into three parts, *viz.*:

1. i. 2—ii. 7 Successive manifestations of divine love to the believing soul.
2. ii. 8—vii. 9 Motives to allure the soul from the world to Christ.
3. vii. 10—viii. 14 Effects produced by these manifestations and motives].

* [The discredit, which ZÖCKLER's hypothesis unwarrantably casts upon Solomon as exhibited in this Song, plainly tends so far as it goes to encumber unnecessarily the question of his authorship.—TR.]

† [WEISS (and more doubtfully PATRICK, AINSWORTH and GILL) translates, "concerning Solomon," conceiving that it is a heavenly and not an earthly personage, who is so designated in this verse as well as in the rest of the Song. NOYES (on the ground of i. 4, 5; iii. 6-11; vii. 5; viii. 11, 12) and THRUPP deny that it was written by Solomon. The former supposes "Canticles to have been written by some Jewish poet either in the reign of Solomon or soon after it." THRUPP objects that Solomon was not fitted by his training to appreciate or depict a pure and holy love; the absence of any allusion to the temple; the typical use made of the figure of Solomon; the mention of Tirzah, vi. 4; certain passages upon which he has put fanciful interpretations, *e. g.* i. 15, from which he infers that "Jerusalem was no longer the religious metropolis of the whole nation;" iv. 4, "the shields of *several successive generations* of warriors;" ii. 15, foxes ravaging the

Digitized by Google

REMARK 1. The position of the Song of Solomon in the literature of the Old Testament is thus defined by DELITZSCH (Section II., p. 9 ff.) as the result of a careful investigation: With the exception of some points of contact with Genesis (comp. *e. g.* vii. 11 with Gen. iii. 16; iv. 11 with Gen. xxvii. 27; viii. 6 with Gen. xlix. 7), it contains no references to the earlier writings of the Bible. Quite as little does it betray any close relationship in ideas or language with the Psalms of David or the Book of Job, the principal productions of the oldest lyric and dramatic literature of the Old Testament. But on the contrary it presents more numerous and significant instances of resemblance to or accordance with those sections of the Book of Proverbs, which date from the time next after Solomon, especially with Prov. i.–ix and xxii.–xxiv; and these are of such a nature as to assert its priority and the imitation of many of its ideas and expressions by the authors of those sections. The correctness of these observations, from which it follows at least that Canticles originated in the Solomonic period, can scarcely be impugned, in view especially of such manifest coincidences as that between Prov. v. 15 ff. and Cant. iv. 15, between Prov. vii. 17 and Cant. iv. 14, between Prov. v. 3 and Cant. iv. 11, between Prov. vi. 30, 31 and Cant. viii. 6, 7, between Prov. xxiii. 31 and Cant. vii. 10. More important, however, than these and like internal testimonies to the existence of the Song of Solomon in an epoch which at any rate was very near that of Solomon (comp. various other characteristic coincidences in individual expressions between this Song and the Proverbs collected by HENGSTENBERG, *das Hohelied Salomo's, etc.*, p. 234 f., and HAEVERNICK, *Einleit.* I., 1, 211) are the indications which point directly to Solomon himself as the author, such as the Song contains in no small number. First of all, it moves among the historical relations of the time of David and Solomon with the utmost confidence. It knows the crown, with which Solomon was crowned by his mother Bathsheba on the day of his marriage (iii. 11), likewise his bed of state made of cedar wood from Lebanon (iii. 9, 10), and his sedan surrounded by sixty of the heroes of Israel (iii. 7); further, the tower of David hung with a thousand shields (iv. 4), the ivory tower of Solomon, as well as the watch-tower built on Lebanon toward Damascus (vii. 5). All these things, to which are to be added the "horses in Pharaoh's chariot," *i. e.* the chariot horses of the king imported from Egypt (i. 9; comp. 1 Kings x. 28, 29; 2 Chron. ix. 28); likewise Solomon's "sixty queens and eighty concubines" (vi. 8; comp. 1 Kings xi. 3); the royal vineyards at Engedi and at Baal-hamon (i. 14; viii. 11); the pools of Heshbon (vii. 5); Shenir, Hermon and Amana, peaks of Lebanon (iv. 8); the plain of Sharon and Mount Carmel (ii. 1; vii. 6), *etc.*—all this is taken in so ready a way from objects immediately at hand, and described upon occasion with such an accurate and thorough knowledge of the things themselves that we cannot deem the author of such descriptions to have been a subject or citizen of Solomon's kingdom or any other than this king himself, the possessor and ruler of the whole. And this especially for the reason that in the way in which the manifold beauties of nature and of art in the kingdom just mentioned are by bold comparisons and luxuriant figures employed to exalt the Shulamite, there is a manifest endeavor to connect whatever in it is grand and entrancing with the king's beloved and to represent the whole as personally concentrated as it were in her. That along with this Solomon is often mentioned in the third person and by name, that not unfrequently he is spoken of in a laudatory way, and once particularly (v. 10-16) the praise of his beauty is dwelt upon at length and in lavish terms from the mouth of his beloved—this can no more be regarded as disproving the authorship of Solomon, than it can be inferred from the mention of Tirzah along with Jerusalem in vi. 4 that the poem did not have its origin until after Solomon's death, in the time when the kingdoms were divided. For Tirzah was doubtless already under David and Solomon a city distinguished for its greatness and beauty, and was only made the royal residence in the northern kingdom by Jeroboam and his immediate successors (1 Kings xiv. 17; xv. 21; xvi.

vineyard of Israel would not be thought of in Solomon's prosperous reign; Ps. xlv., which is imitated in this Song "probably dates from the reign of Jehoshaphat." From these data, which are so intangible as not to require and scarcely to admit of refutation, he infers that the "Song of songs was probably composed about a century or more after the death of Solomon by a member of one of the prophetical schools in the kingdom of the ten tribes." GINSBURG says: "The title of this poem designates Solomon as the author, but internal evidence is against it," that is to say, the explanation which he, in common with other advocates of the shepherd-hypothesis, puts upon it is inconsistent with its having been written by Solomon. But whether in this case the well accredited fact of Solomon's authorship must be given up or the untenable hypothesis must fall is another matter.—TR.]

Digitized by Google

8, 23), for the reason that it had previously attained to a highly flourishing condition and to great consequence, comp. Josh. xii. 24, where it already appears as an ancient city of the Canaanitish kings. The laudation of Solomon, however, like the frequent mention of his name is sufficiently explained by the dramatic constitution of the whole, which made it necessary for the royal poet to speak of himself as objectively as possible (comp. much that is similar in the Psalms of David, *e. g.*, Ps. xx., xxi., cx., likewise in Ps. lxxii. by Solomon) and which in particular "unavoidably brought with it the mutual praise of the lover and his beloved" (Del. p. 17). But a more emphatic testimony than any hitherto adduced, is borne in favor of Solomon himself as the author of the poem, by the extraordinarily developed appreciation of the beauties of nature which the singer exhibits at every point of his performance, and his fondness, which reminds us at once of 1 Kings v. 13 (iv. 33), for figures, tropes and similes highly imaginative in conception and in execution, and drawn from every realm of nature, particularly from animal and plant life. There are mentioned in this poem nearly twenty names of plants (אֱגוֹז *nut*, אֲהָלוֹת *lignaloes*, אֶרֶז *cedar*, חֲבַצֶּלֶת *wild flower*, חִטִּים *wheat*, כֹּפֶר *cyprus-flower*, כַּרְכֹּם *crocus*, לְבֹנָה *frankincense*, מֹר *myrrh*, נֵרְדְּ *nard*, רִמּוֹן *pomegranate*, שׁוֹשָׁן *lily*, תְּאֵנָה *fig*, תַּפּוּחַ *apple*, בְּרוֹת *cypress*, גֶּפֶן *vine*, דּוּדָאִים *mandrakes*, קָנֶה *calamus*, קִנָּמוֹן *cinnamon*), and almost as many names of animals (נְמֵרִים *panthers*, סוּסָה *horse*, עֹרֵב *raven*, עִזִּים *goats*, עֹפֶר הָאַיָּלִים *a young hart*, אַיֶּלֶת הַשָּׂדֶה *hind*, שׁוּעָלִים *foxes*, תּוֹר *turtle-dove*, אֲרָיוֹת *lions*, גְּדִיּוֹת *kids*, יוֹנִים *doves*, צְבִי *gazelle*, רְחֵלִים *sheep*; comp. also שֵׁן *ivory*, which is named several times). And not a few of these names are Hapaxlegomena or like the names of valuable minerals (as שֵׁשׁ *marble*, תַּרְשִׁישׁ *turquoise*, סַפִּיר *sapphire*) which are also found here, occur but rarely in other books of the Old Testament. If we duly consider the small compass of the piece, in which such an abundance of names of remarkable natural objects is crowded together, and estimate besides the repeated occurrence of many of these names and the "various points of view under which they are contemplated (*e. g.* in the pomegranate, its pulp when cut, iv. 3; vi. 7; its buds, vi. 11; vii. 13; its juice, viii. 2)," we can scarcely help, in view of the fact that numerous internal and external indications point to the age of Solomon as the date of the Song, finding its author in Solomon himself, the renowned royal sage, whom the book of Kings (*loc. cit.*) praises as at once the greatest of natural philosophers and the most fertile composer of songs. Moreover the criterion afforded in vi. 8 for the more exact determination of the period of his life, in which Solomon composed this poem, must in no wise be overlooked. From a comparison of this passage with 1 Kings xi. 3 f. we can conclude with entire certainty that the period in question was that middle age of the king when his decline from his former sincere obedience to the commandments of the Lord had already begun, without having attained that depth of moral degeneracy which it subsequently reached. This was already substantially the opinion of Grotius in his *Adnotat. in V. T.* respecting the date and origin of the Song of Solomon (after those Jewish interpreters in *Bereshith Rabba*, *Jalkut* and *Pesikta*, who supposed that Canticles was composed by Solomon in his younger years*), only he (as also v. Hofmann, see § 2 Remark 1) erroneously explained it of the marriage of Solomon with an Egyptian princess and mingled in many notions of its contents as referring to the mysteries of married life, which were offensive to the æsthetic and moral feelings of Christian readers. (Comp. Delitzsch, p. 14, 55).

Remark 2. The most considerable objections of modern critics against the Solomonic authenticity of Canticles are those which are drawn from its language. Yet no decisive argument against its genuineness can be constructed out of them, because the alleged traces of a later Aramæizing type of the language, which it presents, may all without exception be explained as characteristic of the poetic character of its diction. So, first of all, the abbreviated relative

* [Moody Stuart and others imagine that this Song was written by Solomon before he ascended the throne, conceiving this to be the reason why he is not called king, i. 1; comp. Prov. i. 1; Eccles. i. 1. Gill thinks the omission of his regal title is an intimation of the allegorical nature of the Song, and argues from the mention, vii. 4, of the "tower of Lebanon," which he identifies with the "house of the forest of Lebanon," 1 Kings vii. 2, that Solomon must have been king for at least twenty years, when this book was written. Poole: "Composed by Solomon, but whether before his fall or after his repentance, is not easy to determine, nor necessary to be known."—Tr.]

Digitized by Google

שֶׁ for אֲשֶׁר, which, though foreign to prose and to the semi-prosaic language of the gnomic poets of the earlier period, and on this account neither used by the author of the prosaic title to this book (comp. above, p. 1), nor even by Solomon in his proverbs (Prov. x. 1—xxii. 16, where as in the Proverbs generally the form אֲשֶׁר is invariably found), nevertheless occurs in several poems, of acknowledged antiquity, especially in the Song of Deborah, which is certainly pre-Solomonic (Judg. v. 7; עַד שַׁקַּמְתִּי דְּבוֹרָה), as well as in the book of Job (chap. xix. 29), which probably dates from the time of Solomon. The fact, that a part of the poetry designated as Solomon's in the canon, *viz.*, the Proverbs and the 72d Psalm (which presents however some other coincidences in diction and expression with Canticles), uses the prosaic אֲשֶׁר, and this Song alone the highly poetic שֶׁ is entirely analogous to the circumstance that the prophet Jeremiah only makes use of this abbreviated form in his Lamentations (*e. g.* ii. 15 f.; iv. 9; v. 18), whilst his prophetic discourses, which often pass into the poetic, always have אֲשֶׁר only. It follows hence inevitably that שֶׁ is essentially poetic, while yet it is not necessarily adapted to all kinds of poetry; and for this very reason it cannot be regarded as a sign of the post-exilic origin of this poem. The same judgment precisely must be passed upon the form שַׁלָּמָה i. 7 (a combination of the confirmatory שׁ and the interrogative לָמָה, not a modification of the Aram. דלמא "perhaps"). Likewise the Aramæisms נָטַר for נָצַר (i. 6; viii. 11, 12), בְּרוֹת for ברוש (i. 17), סְתָו "winter" (ii. 11) are sufficiently explained from that preference for a *recherché* and highly poetical style of expression, which also led the poet to adopt the unusual forms שִׂפְתוֹת for שִׂפְתֵי (iv. 3), מִדְבָּר for פֶּה (*ibid.*), רַעְיָה for רֵעָה (i. 9, 15; ii. 2. Comp. Ps. xlv. 15), גַּנִּים for גַּנּוֹת (iv. 15; vi. 2; viii. 13), and many more of the same sort; and consequently there is the less need for regarding them (with Ewald and some others) as idioms in the dialect of Northern Palestine,* and consequently as proofs that the poem originated in one of the northern tribes, whether before or after the division of the kingdom. Many peculiarities of language are also without doubt to be imputed to Solomon's cosmopolitan turn of mind and views of the world, which inclined him to introduce all the foreign artists and works of art that he possibly could into his kingdom (comp. 1 Kin. vii. 13 ff.; x. 11 ff.), and would also impel him to incorporate words from foreign lands into the not very copious language of Hebrew poetry. There may thus be referred to a foreign origin, if not exactly the names of plants נֵרְדְּ (comp. Sansc. *naladâ*, old Pers. *narada*), כַּרְכֹּם (Sansc. *kunkuma*, lat. *curcuma*), אֲהָלוֹת (Sansc. *aguru* or *aghil*), yet perhaps the expressions פַּרְדֵּס for "pleasure garden" (iv. 13) and אַפִּרְיוֹן for "royal litter" or "palanquin" (iii. 9), the former to the Indian *pradêça* "wall" (Hitzig), or to the Zend *pairidaêza* "mound of earth, wall" (according to Spiegel, Haug, Ew., *etc.*), and the latter to the Sansc. *paryâna* "riding saddle" (not, as Jerome, and most recently Magnus and Schlottmann supposed, to the Greek φορεῖον). And yet even in the case of these two words a foreign origin is not demonstrable with absolute certainty, for פַּרְדֵּס might be an Aram. quadrilateral for פָּרַס, and of the same signification with פַּדָּן "plain, field," and אַפִּרְיוֹן a derivative from the root פָּרָה after the analogy of פִּדְיוֹן, *etc.*, synonymous with the Aram. פּוּרְיָא "bed;" comp. Delitzsch, p. 22–26. But even though the foreign origin of these expressions, and of many others besides, were to be regarded as made out, the possibility of Canticles having been composed by Solomon, or having at least originated in the time of Solomon, could not in any case be denied on this ground, or on that of its other linguistic peculiarities. And the less so, because so many other indications point to its origin in a much earlier period than *e. g.* that of the exile assumed by Umbreit and others, or even that of the Greek domination assumed by Hartmann (on the ground of אפריון φορεῖον, iii. 9). On the whole, the judgment expressed by Hengstenberg (*Comm.* p. 237 f.) in regard to the linguistic peculiarities of the Song of Solomon, still remains correct: "That the author is not dependent on the Aramæizing usage of later times, but is governed throughout by design and by free choice, is plain 1)" from the fact that with the exception of שׁ scarcely anything is to be

* [So Thrupp, who also classes here the "chariots of my people," vi. 12; comp. 2 Kin. ii. 12; xiii. 14.—Tr.]

found, which recurs again in the later usage of the language; the foreign forms are exclusively peculiar to the Song of Solomon"—(but here פַּרְדֵּס, which is also found, Eccles. ii. 5, is an exception) [that is, on the assumption in which Zöckler and Hengstenberg concur, that Ecclesiastes was not written by Solomon, but belongs to a later age.—Tr.]—2) "that the language has a youthful freshness, as in none of the products belonging to the times of a degenerate Hebrew." Comp. also Döpke, *Hohel.*, p. 28 ff., Ewald, p. 16 ff., Hitzig, p. 8 ff. (who, however, like Ewald, gathers up the Aramæisms of the piece in a one-sided way in favor of his hypothesis that it belongs to the north of Palestine, and hence was not written by Solomon) and Delitzsch, p. 19 ff.

§ 4. THE ETHICAL IDEA AND THE TYPICAL IMPORT OF THE SONG OF SOLOMON.

The conjugal love of Solomon and Shulamith, described in Canticles, has a significance beyond itself and its own times. As the love of the wise and glorious king of Israel to a plain, pure-minded and marvellously beautiful maiden from among his people, it mirrors forth the relation of Jehovah, the covenant God of the theocracy to the Old Testament people of God as His bride, and the chosen object of His love (comp. Hos. ii. 18, 21; Isa. liv. 5; lxii. 4, 5; Jer. ii. 2; iii. 1 ff.; iv. 30; xiii. 22, 26; xxx. 14; Ezek. xvi. 8, *etc.*), and is a prophecy of the far stronger, and more tender manifestation of His love, which God has condescended to bestow on all mankind in the times of the New Testament salvation. The love of Solomon to Shulamith is a type of the loving communion between Christ and His Church (John iii. 29; Mat. ix. 15, *etc.*), nay, a prophecy of that glorious culmination and final act in His loving union with it, which Paul, Eph. v. 31 f. designates as the "great mystery," which is to form the last and highest fulfilment of nature's sacred law of marriage (Gen. ii. 24: "For this cause shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh"). It is no objection to this assumption of a typical and Messianic character of the Song of Solomon, that the idea of conjugal or wedded love is not exhibited in it in unsullied moral purity, but impaired in various ways by the dark back-ground of polygamy, and that it is Solomon who appears as the guilty party, as the cause of this partial spoiling of the ideal substance of the action. For in spite of Solomon's sad degeneracy, which had already, by the time of the action described in this poem, seized upon his heart, once devoted beyond others to obedience to the word of God (see 1 Kin. iii. 9 ff.), and in spite of the merely temporary nature of his conversion wrought by Shulamith, which was afterwards followed by a still lower fall, he nevertheless is and remains one of the most distinguished types of the Messiah in the entire series of Old Testament prefigurations, as Christ's own comparison of His wisdom and glory with that of Solomon teaches us (Matt. xii. 42; comp. vi. 28). But Shulamith, the enchantingly beautiful daughter of the land of Israel, in whose fair body dwelt a still fairer soul, and among whose noble virtues a chaste but fondly loving heart, and an humble mind of child-like simplicity shone in the first rank—Shulamith appears as a striking type of the Church of Christ. And this becomes the more appropriate in proportion as the Church more and more plainly presents the figure of a maiden raised from a low condition to glorious communion with her royal bridegroom, and as her cordial, humble, loving attachment and adherence to her Lord, faithful unto death, such as she should manifest according to her true idea, and as she actually does manifest in growing measure in her true members, resembles the love of that plain shepherd's daughter to her royal lord and master. There is certainly this dissimilitude in the parallel, that the morally purifying, ennobling and delivering influence in the typical relation between Solomon and Shulamith, proceeds from the wife, while in the grand antitype, the formation of the new covenant by Christ, the redeeming and sanctifying agency belongs to the husband (comp. Eph. v. 25 ff.). But a partial discrepancy of this nature, or even contrast between the type and its prototype, is found in a greater or less degree in every prefiguration of the history of redemption; comp. the Old Testament parallel between Adam and Christ, Rom. v. 12 ff., between the termination of David's earthly life and that of Christ's, Acts xiii. 36, 37, between Jonah and the Lord, as a greater prophet than he, Matt. xii. 40. And furthermore, that very dissimilitude involves also an important resemblance, inasmuch as Christ's coming down to His people was one with the riches of heaven becoming poor, and one

Digitized by Google

divinely glorious becoming a servant (2 Cor. viii. 9; Phil. ii. 6 ff.), induced thereto really by their mute waiting and supplication; and inasmuch as this being drawn by the power of a child-like confiding love, is repeated again and again between the Lord and every believing soul among His people, and shall be repeated to the end of time (John xiv. 23; Matt. xviii. 20; Rev. iii. 20).

It will constitute the task of the sections in this Commentary, which relate to the development of the doctrinal and ethical ideas, to point out in detail the peculiar combination of the typical by analogy, and the typical by contrast in the relations between the persons of this Song on the one hand, and Christ and His Church on the other. Shulamith will prevailingly appear to be an ethical, and Solomon a metaphysical type of Christ. The character of the former will offer an abundance of models for the direct imitation of Christians in their religious life, whilst her royal lover, by his position in the theocracy and in the history of redemption, and by the elevation to a dignity of equal distinction which he accords to the poor maiden will be a direct type of the Redeemer. The allegorical exegesis which fails to recognize or obliterates the partial contrast between him and the Saviour, or the attempt to make out the unconditional and thoroughly Messianic character of the piece at the expense of its historical truth, will find its refutation and correction step by step along with this Exposition.

REMARK 1.—That the fundamental thought of the Song of Solomon lies essentially in the praise of the joyful happiness of wedded love, that its mystery therefore is no other than the mystery of marriage (Eph. v. 31, 32), and that this its mystical idea is vividly presented in one of the most remarkable events of Solomon's life, which is of such great significance in the history of redemption,—this is the estimate put upon it, and the position accorded to it in Biblical Theology by DELITZSCH, and in substantial agreement with him by VON HOFMANN, and this we are convinced is the only correct one. The latter says (in a "Supplement" to DELITZSCH'S *Hohe Lied*, p. 237 f.): "Canticles is a song of love, which is here exhibited in all the fulness of its beauty, grace and power, richly adorned besides with the royal splendor of Solomon, and still in the purity and chastity of the marriage bond. As opposed to any heathen composition that can be compared with it, it is a monument of the unfolding of the natural life to the splendor of its full bloom of earthly bliss in a manner pleasing to God, such an unfolding as was possible only where the natural life was under the protection of a guidance which was shaping its way to the ultimate redemption. And if we look at the place which it holds in the sacred history, at the end of five hundred years' direct development of Israel, when in his king and his king's son (Ps. lxxii. 1) the complete form of national sovereignty had been reached, it has its significance in regard to the spiritual counterpart of this glory, that in his whole estate the king has nothing on earth to which his heart is so completely given, as Shulamith, his only love: in this personal, human relation he finds the full satisfaction of his life. When the King of glory, in whom we hope, appears, His people shall also be His bride. His Church is to Him both people and wife, as the relation between man and woman established at the creation is no less a prophecy of Christ and His Church, than the relation of the king of Israel to His people in the history of redemption. The relation, in which the Lord stands to His Church is entirely a personal one, like that between Solomon and Shulamith. Then we shall not expound this or that particular in the Song of songs of him, but the glad antitype of the loving communion which it sings shall have come to pass, identical with the antitype of the relation between the anointed of the Lord and Israel." Comp. *Schriftbeweis* II. 2, p. 370 f.: "The poet sets before our eyes the depth and the blessedness of this love of the sexes (of which it is said viii. 6 that it is "strong as death") and the glory of corporeal beauty, when love is awakened and nourished by it, both of them as the natural products of creative energy, and therefore abstracted from those moral qualities which impart to corporeal beauty a value dependent on the individual, and lend to the love of the sexes a basis and a substance dependent on the individual. . . . . . Only in the same sense, therefore, in which the creation of woman was the institution of marriage, can Canticles be called an extolling of marriage. The divinely created relation of the sexes as differing and yet belonging together, upon which marriage rests, is praised, and that in the richness of its beauty, by the king in whom the people of God attained its highest earthly glory, as the good which in his view surpassed all the good things in his royal

Digitized by Google

magnificence," *etc.* From this statement of the fundamental idea of the poem by HOFMANN, DELITZSCH differs principally in doing fuller justice to the noble virtues, which in addition to her physical beauty adorn its heroine, and consequently making not merely marriage in general, marriage as belonging to the realm of nature and of sense, but an ideal marriage, or at least an ideal wedded love and fidelity the object extolled by the poet. He hopes (according to p. 155 ff.) that he has by his exposition led to the recognition of a side of the Song of Solomon hitherto ignored or neglected: "*viz.*, the ethical character of Shulamith, the fine and feeling picture of her soul, fairer even than the fair body which it tenanted, and in general her profound, persistent and calm moral earnestness, the golden ground on which the smiling colors of this joyous song are every where laid." "Shulamith's beauty," he continues, "is not mere physical beauty of the corporeal form, nor the beauty of a Grecian statue of Aphrodite, when one feels as though the finely shaped marble began to live and to walk. Her beauty is not merely natural, but moral and living. This moral life is not indeed the New Testament spiritual life from God, which will finally transform the physical life into its own likeness, but at the same time it has not the mere semblance of virtue, in which what are only *splendida vitia* so often shine not only in the heathen world, but in the world at large. The morality of Shulamith is no more devoid of substance and value than the Old Testament morality in general. Shulamith is still nature and not spirit, but her nature has been well trained in the fear of Jehovah, hallowed by the grace of Jehovah. What is specifically Israelitish indeed recedes in Shulamith quite into the background behind the universally human. This is the fundamental character of all the written productions of the Chokmah in the time of Solomon. But this splendid and fragrant growth of a hallowed nature and a noble maidenhood does not disown the soil on which it has grown. It is the soil of the revelation deposited in Israel."* As the particular moral traits or virtues in Shulamith's character, he then specifies—1) her sincere, really personal and not merely sensual love for her royal lover; 2) her child-like and naive simplicity; 3) her hearty delight in nature; 4) her chaste and pure womanhood; 5) her sisterly love and filial affection for her mother. The effect which this profoundly moral character of hers has upon Solomon, consists in his "becoming a child himself in the noblest sense of the word through the influence of Shulamith." "The love with which, simple, humble, chaste as she is, she inspires the king, teaches the wise man child-like simplicity, brings the king down into the vale of humility, sets respectful bounds to the impetuous lover. He is compelled to acknowledge that this lily of the field in the artless attire of her beauty and her virtue is more richly adorned than he in all his glory. Nature no longer speaks to the natural philosopher the language of perplexing enigmas, but the gentle language of love. The possessor of a full harem has found the one to whom henceforth his heart belongs, and to no other besides. Following her he willingly exchanges the bustle and splendor of court life for the retirement and simplicity of the country. Afar from his palace, if he but has her on his arm, he roves over mountain and meadow, and with her he is contented in her cottage. Shulamith has become queen without surrendering the virtues of the plain, poor country maid, and Solomon has become Shulamith's husband without losing his royal dignity. Solomon's character in fact appears in twice as fine a light in his self-humiliation, and so does Shulamith in her exaltation." Further considerations respecting the ethical character of the two lovers and the typical significance of their relation to each other, and its place in the history of redemption, will be adduced in the "doctrinal and ethical" remarks upon each section of the Song.

REMARK 2.—HITZIG has attempted to treat the action of the poem as purely ideal, as mere fable or fiction without historical truth. "It is not to be supposed," he says on p. 3 of his Commentary, "that a real history, which either contained this moral of itself, or admitted of its introduction, lies at the basis of this Song. On the contrary, some occurrence living in story may have suggested just this dress. If it concerned merely the king and his lady love, the poet might match Solomon and Shulamith about as well as Tryphon and Tryphæna. The partner introduced for Solomon is הַשּׁוּלַמִּית, "the Shulamite," so like the name of the king, that the resemblance

* [The implication that the life of the people of God under the Old Testament was not only upon a lower level, but was specifically different from that under the New Testament, belongs to the philosophical speculations which DELITZSCH is fond of indulging. He conceives that the fact of the incarnation introduced an entirely new element into human nature which did not exist, and could not have existed prior to that event.—TR.]

Digitized by Google

cannot be mistaken. Now a fair damsel from Shunem (Shulem) really was at one time brought to court, when Solomon was young (1 Kings i. 3, 4), on whose account Solomon had his half-brother put to death for proposing to marry her, 1 Kings ii. 13–25. This deed, which might seem to have sprung from jealousy (comp. the thesis viii. 6; Prov. vi. 34 f.) together with the similarity of "Shulamith" and "Solomon," may have first determined the direction in which the idea should incorporate itself."—Against this combination of HITZIG's (substantially adopted by WEISSBACH, p. 66 f.), which is designed to show the mythical character of the piece, may be urged in general all the probable grounds for its composition by Solomon himself, or even for its originating in Solomon's time, which were presented in § 3; and in particular still further: 1) the complete unison—not partial merely—between the historical situation described in the piece and the state of culture in the times of Solomon as depicted in the books of Kings, or, in other words, the absence of any contradiction between the Solomon of history and the Solomon of this book, together with the numerous striking and wholly undesigned coincidences in the situation and character of both. 2) The improbability of an intentional parallel between the names "Solomon" and "Shulamith," which have no surprising similarity of sound, and are not contrasted any where in the piece, though opportunities for doing so were not rare (ii. 16; iv. 1 ff.; vi. 3; vii. 11; viii. 11 ff). 3) It is extremely forced and far-fetched to identify the heroine of the Song with Abishag of Shunem, David's concubine, and especially to explain viii. 6 of a supposed jealousy about this Shulamitess, which might have moved Solomon to put his brother Adonijah to death. 4) It is a very probable and obvious assumption that Shunem, on account of the remarkable beauty of its daughters, may have been the home of one of the concubines of the king of Israel in more instances than just this one, 1 Kings i. 3, 4, and that this furnishes the explanation of the gentile denomination of the heroine of this piece as "the Shunamitess" (Shulamitess). 5) The analogy of the book of Job, which likewise has a historical fact as its basis underneath its dramatic form (comp. HIRZEL, *Job*, p. 7 ff.), in spite of the fact that its peculiarly speculative character seems in a much higher degree to favor the assumption that its contents are purely fictitious.*

[NOTE ON THE INTERPRETATION OF THE SONG OF SOLOMON—*By the Translator*.—The substitution of the typical method, for which ZÖCKLER contends, in place of the allegorical, which has hitherto chiefly prevailed among evangelical interpreters of this book, marks a decided and most wholesome advance in its exposition. It is bringing into the study of the Canticles that method which has been applied with such salutary effect to the investigation of the Old Testament in general, and of its types in particular, by the most recent and able biblical scholars, and which is represented, for example, in the well-known writings of KURTZ and FAIRBAIRN.

1. The allegorical method, which it is proposed to discard, regards the persons and objects described in this song, as in themselves unreal, as mere figures or names for spiritual persons and objects, which latter were the actual and only things contemplated and intended by the inspired penman. In what he here writes of Solomon and Shulamith he had before his mind not two real or even imaginary persons possessing definite characteristics, and sustaining a known relation to each other, which were symbols of spiritual characteristics and of a spiritual relation, the contemplation of the former being a medium through which he and others might rise to a fuller and more correct comprehension of the latter. But in all the language which he employs he is directly and consciously describing Christ and His Church. He imputes certain physical attributes or outward acts to Solomon, but it is not because they in fact belonged to him personally, or were appropriate to him as a man, a monarch, or a husband, but because there are certain attributes or works of Christ, of which these are or may be constituted emblems. And so in every expression used respecting the bride he is not depicting a human person real or ideal, but is simply employing a figure of speech which is to be applied directly to the Church, and which finds its justification in its fitness to set forth some feature or characteristic of the Church.

Hence, it happens that the great body of the allegorical interpreters, even the ablest and the best, refrain from inquiring into the meaning of the language used in its literal application, as

* [The connection of Shulamith with Shunem does not seem to be as certain, as ZÖCKLER conceives it, though his scheme of the book is largely built upon it. The derivation of the name from Solomon has commended itself to many who have no sympathy with HITZIG's ridiculous conceit about Abishag.—TR.]

Digitized by Google

though this were no part of its true and proper intent, but apply it immediately to Christ and His Church as the parties directly described, and the only ones, in fact, who come fairly within its scope. So far from possessing themselves first of the literal sense of the Song in its primary application to the sphere of natural life, and making this the basis from which to rise to a spiritual significance which should carry the same principles into a higher sphere, viewing in the outward and the human a reflection of the inward and divine, they positively assert that no consistent literal sense is discoverable. And they triumph in the assertion as an unanswerable argument, precluding the possibility of any other than a spiritual interpretation, whereas they are destroying the foundation underneath themselves, and making it impossible upon their principles to build up any exposition of the book which shall not rest upon the sand. It is certainly a most extraordinary procedure by which to substantiate the claim that the spiritual and the divine are in this Song set forth under the image of the earthly, to annihilate the latter with a view to exalting the former. If there is no substance nor consistency in the earthly image, what becomes of the heavenly counterpart? They who proclaim that they can make no consistent sense of the Song in its literal acceptation, should remember that the natural presumption will be not that no such sense exists, but that they have failed to find the key to its understanding. And if they cannot interpret the earthly meaning which lies upon the surface, what assurance can they give that they are safe guides to its heavenly and hidden mysteries? What is this but to play into the hands of those who claim that they can give a consistent sense to it literally underderstood, and that no higher meaning is necessary or possible?

We greatly deprecate such language as the following from so devout and evangelical a commentator as Wordsworth: "Upon the principles of the literal interpretation, how can it be explained that in the Canticles, the bridegroom is called by such various names? How are we to account for the fact that the same person, who is called the beloved, is also designated as a king, as King Solomon, as a shepherd, as feeding among lilies, as an owner of a garden and of a vineyard, which he has let out to keepers, and of which he will require the fruit?" This is, in our judgment, simply a concession to those who insist that there is more than one lover here spoken of, or who make of the Song itself a jumble of incoherent fragments. Again, we must utter our most vehement protest against such statements as these from the same able writer: "If the objects to which the bride is compared in the Canticles are understood in their literal sense, such a picture will be produced as would deserve to be censured and condemned in the strong language of the Roman critic denouncing a tasteless and ill-assorted rhapsody of incongruous enormities." "How, again, are we to interpret the description of the bridegroom's features? Expounded literally, some of the details in the portrait are absurd and ridiculous, others are even repulsive and revolting." It becomes a question whether it is not more reverential to divine inspiration to abandon the spiritual sense altogether, if it can only be maintained by thus vilifying this sacred Song.

2. Besides this neglect and undue depreciation of the literal sense, we object to the allegorical method, in the second place, that it inverts the true relation between the outward form and the spiritual substance in this Song. By an original divine constitution there are thoughts and ideas embodied in the sphere of natural life, which reach into the spiritual sphere, and these are made use of as helps for climbing from the lower to the higher. We must not lose sight of the divine economy in this matter. There was not, first, the communication of a complete system of doctrine in its fulness and in abstract form, which the sacred writer, being in entire possession of, seeks to impart to others—and in so doing, looks about for some analogy which he strives to adapt to it, even at the risk of utterly distorting the inferior object which he so employs. But the type comes before the doctrine, and is preparatory to it. God places before the eyes of His inspired servants, and through them before all others, these outward types, with their correspondences to the heavenly and divine. These natural objects and relations furnish the lessons which under divine guidance they are to study, by which they are to be educated to the comprehension of the spiritual, which is wrapped up in them, and which they are adapted to convey.

3. The allegorical method further violates the analogy of Old Testament instruction. This was once the favorite mode of dealing with types, but it led to such fanciful, grotesque and far-fetched explanations as to bring the whole subject of typology into disrepute, and it has now been dis-

Digitized by Google

carded by sober inquirers. The true principles are thus stated by Prof. FAIRBAIRN, *Typology*, I., pp. 81 ff.: "In the interpretation of types our first care must be to make ourselves acquainted with the truths or ideas involved in them merely as providential transactions or religious services—to make what they were in their immediate relation to the patriarchal or religious worshipper, the ground and matter of what, as typical, they are now to the Christian." "Their typical import is not something apart from their natural and immediate design, but consisting of that and growing out of it." "The essential character and objects of the transaction, in which the type consists, become thus the ground and matter of its typical relation to the realities of the gospel. But if we should proceed in an opposite direction and make the essential qualities of the antitype the measure of what we are to expect in the type, then, as a matter of course, we shall be driven to seek in the latter many trifling and fanciful resemblances, which have no idea or principle in them whatever." The Messianic teaching of the Psalms, which belong to the same stage of divine revelation with the Song of Solomon, is entirely of the typical character. It is wholly drawn from the personal experience or the official position of David or of Solomon, more or less idealized, with or without a removal of human limitations. It is not until we reach the period of the prophets that the typical element recedes into the background, and is partially, though not entirely, superseded by a more didactic style of instruction. No one can fail to recognize the distinction in this respect between Canticles and Ezekiel, ch. xvi., xxiii.

4. It also disregards the needs of the people of God under the Old Testament. It must be assumed that Canticles, like every other book of Scripture, had its special adaptation to the wants of those for whom it was immediately prepared. It was part of the divine system of instruction under which they were placed, and had its determinate function to fulfil in preparation for Him that was to come. Now if it contained the mysteries which allegorical interpreters find hidden under its language, it must have been to its earliest readers a sealed book. They did not have before them the detailed history and doctrine of Christ and His Church, from which conjecturally to fit expressions in the Song by a mere casual and superficial similitude. Nor could they be expected to have any inkling whatever of the meaning of passages, whose sense is elicited by punning upon words, as though the "chains," i. 10, represent the "law," because תּוֹרִים bears some resemblance in sound to תּוֹרָה, and the "cyprus flower," i. 14, alludes to the atonement because of an ambiguity in the word כֹּפֶר. If this is the way that Canticles is to be expounded, it is a mere book of riddles, whose solution is sufficiently puzzling and doubtful with all the facts and teachings of the gospels before us, but which could not possibly be comprehended while the objects referred to were still veiled by the future. If, however, the language of Canticles describes not future or unknown objects in enigmatical terms, but scenes real or ideal belonging to the sphere of earthly love, which is a symbol of the heavenly, then the analogies of thought must lead directly from one to the other. And Solomon's contemporaries, as well as later generations, could rise at least to a partial comprehension of its meaning; not, it is true, to an exhaustive understanding of it, for the deep meaning of Scripture grows with growing light and fuller knowledge and further revelation. But the more advanced interpretation must lie in the line just indicated, only penetrating further, not in the way of loading the text with far-fetched and fanciful senses. Scripture does not have a multiple sense, if by this be meant that it is to bear every signification which can by possibility be put upon its disconnected words; but the ideas manifestly underlying it may be followed out into further developments and wider applications.

5. Our last objection to the allegorical method is that it cannot achieve a well grounded and satisfactory interpretation of this book. It loses itself perpetually in details, where it spends its strength in random guess-work. The ingenuity with which this may be done, and the devout spirit with which it may be pervaded, cannot alter the essentially vicious character of the process. As ADAM CLARKE justly says, he could make anything whatever out of this Song that he was disposed to make, if he were allowed equal liberty: he could find Arminianism in it or any type of doctrine he chose. The pious use made of the language of the book cannot redeem it from the charge of mal-interpretation. It is not exposition but substituting human fancies for the true meaning and intent of the divine Word. The pious senses inserted, the edifying reflections and the devout meditations do not sanctify a mode of dealing with the book of God so utterly unwarrantable.

Digitized by Google

This mode of expounding each separate particular, not with a view to its place in the description in which it stands, but as a distinct reference to the spiritual object typified by it, necessarily leads both to a serious distortion of the lessons to be conveyed, and to a marring and mangling of the symmetry and beauty of the objects depicted. Thus Dr. ADDISON ALEXANDER in his Commentary on Isaiah v. 3, "The parable, as a whole, corresponds to its subject as a whole, but all the particulars included in the one, are not separately intended to denote particulars included in the other. A lion may be a striking emblem of a hero; but it does not follow that the mane, claws, *etc.*, of the beast must all be significant of something in the man. Nay, they cannot even be supposed to be so, without sensibly detracting from the force and beauty of the image as a whole." See also similar language used on Isaiah lx. 7, and in his Commentary on Mark iv. 13, and xii. 6. Is it surprising that WORDSWORTH could see no beauty in the figures of this book literally understood after mercilessly carving them to shapeless fragments by his dissecting knife?

For these reasons we believe the typical to be the true method of interpreting this Song, and we shall conceive it to be a most important service rendered by this commentary if it shall in any measure contribute to check the unbridled extravagance of the prevalent devotion to allegory and encourage a simpler and juster style of interpretation. According to the typical understanding of Canticles, which has already been characterized in the general, but may here be more exactly described, its primary subject and that which is denoted by its language in its literal acceptation is the loving intercourse of king Solomon and his bride. But in consequence of Solomon's representative character as the vicegerent and type of the divine king of Israel, his individual and earthly relations become the mirror of the spiritual and the heavenly. His human love to the woman of his choice is the symbol of the love of God to His elect people, of Jehovah to Israel, of Christ to His church. This latter is not directly and enigmatically described by the terms of the Song, but is shadowed forth by the scenes and the feelings which are depicted in it. The Solomon of the Song is not the heavenly, but the earthly Solomon: he is presented, however, not in his individual personality merely, but in the capacity of a king and a lover or a husband, thus suggesting the ideal king and the ideal lover, and to this extent, and in this manner, shadowing forth the greatest and most glorious of monarchs, the most tender and affectionate, the most loving and the best of bridegrooms, Jehovah-Jesus.

The very first step toward the correct understanding of this book as of any type, or parable, or similitude whatsoever is the inquiry after its literal sense,—what is the object itself that is here presented? It is impossible to develop the spiritual meaning of a symbol until it is first ascertained what the symbol is. The literal sense is the foundation of the whole. If this be not correctly gathered and distinctly apprehended, every ulterior result is vitiated. The most cursory inspection shows this book to relate to the loving intercourse of a bridegroom and his bride. But what is the precise nature and the mutual relations of the several scenes depicted? Do the various parts cohere in one connected narrative, which traces through successive steps the growing intimacy of the loving pair? if so, what is the story, or the plot which forms the ground work of the book? Or does it contain a series of detached scenes, each complete in itself? if so, what are the limits of each, and what the precise situation and action depicted in it? Is the whole prior to marriage, or subsequent to marriage, or does the marriage occur in the course of the Song, and if so, where? A true conception must first be gained of the book in the exhibition which it makes of the human love described in it, before we can be prepared to understand the particular aspect, method, or measures of divine love which it is adapted to set forth.

The service performed by the erotic commentators on this Song in the history of interpretation, is that of directing attention to this most astonishing oversight on the part of the allegorists, one extreme as usual generating its opposite, and thus preparing the way for its own correction. The egregious perversions of the literal sense by those who have bestowed upon it their exclusive attention can only be fairly refuted and their utter baselessness shown, when the correct scheme of this book shall be fully drawn out and fortified in every part.

In our opinion ZÖCKLER has not been as successful in his results as he is correct in his method. Neither he nor DELITZSCH, whom he follows with some modifications, has solved the problem of the book so far as to make a faithful exhibit of its literal sense. They are both captivated with

Digitized by Google

the idea, which we are persuaded is fallacious, of finding a regularly unfolded plot, and in their eagerness to make out continuity and progress they have obtruded upon this sacred poem what finds no warrant in its text, and marred the artless simplicity of its structure by needless complications. A complete and satisfactory presentation of the literal sense of Canticles is a very great desideratum; and this is the direction in which we are disposed to look with the greatest hope for further progress in unfolding its more profound mysteries.

Upon the literal is built the ethical sense. DELITZSCH here loses himself too much in a mere romantic sentimentalism. The erotic interpreters, as GINSBURG, discover an example of virtue superior to the greatest temptations: they make it a story of faithful love shown in a maiden, whom the king by all his arts and by the most dazzling allurements cannot seduce from her shepherd lover to whom she had given her heart. ZÖCKLER here attempts a compromise which is an attitude he frequently occupies in the course of his commentary. He drops the shepherd lover, but still represents Solomon in an unfavorable though less repulsive light, and makes all the pure and elevating influence proceed from Shulamith, who is the true heroine of the Song, and by whom her royal husband is completely over-shadowed. The discontent with Solomon's court and with the style of life prevailing there, which DELITZSCH affirms, is pushed by ZÖCKLER to what is perhaps its legitimate result, dissatisfaction with Solomon himself who was tainted by the corrupting influences around him. She however wins the proud lord of a harem completely to herself and makes him all her own; from love to her he forsakes his voluptuous court for the retirement and gentle pleasures of her country home. He thus finds in it the triumph of chastity over sensuality, of a pure monogamy over the voluptuousness of polygamy.

We cannot deny that there is a certain attractiveness at the first view in the thought of a rebuke to polygamy in the person of one, by whom it was carried to such unheard of excess, if it were not that the whole thing is imported into the Song by the mere fancy of the interpreter. Whatever unfavorable surmises might attach to Solomon's life as recorded in Kings, there is nothing whatever in this book to justify them. He says and does nothing to warrant the suspicion of a want of constancy in his love for Shulamith or a fickle preference for others. Shulamith never betrays any apprehension that she has not her full share of his love, or that his conduct belies his professions of fond attachment. The temporary separation—it can scarcely be called estrangement—which gives her so much pain, is traced by herself to her own drowsy inaction, v. 3. The only allusion to the existing number of queens, vi. 8, is for the sake of ranking her above them all as the idol of her husband's heart. The daughters of Jerusalem never appear as rivals, toward whom Shulamith expresses or cherishes any jealousy. But apart from the unfounded presumptions on which the whole is based, it involves a preposterous conflict between Solomon's regal dignity and his married state, that in order to possess Shulamith as his own, and be completely hers, he should have to abandon his capital and his court and the occupations of royalty, and go to live with her in her mother's house at Shunem. And further, it is a most extraordinary mode of inculcating monogamy for Shulamith to marry a king already the possessor of sixty queens, and then to set about securing him entirely to herself, and leading him to abandon all the rest. Would not this be more like the artful intriguing favorite than the guileless, simple-hearted child of nature, which she is represented as being?

All that can in fairness be made out of the ethical view of this book, as it appears to us, is that two parties are here described who live in and for each other. Proofs and instances are given of their devotion and fondness, their ardent longing for each other when separated, their delight in each other when united, their increased enjoyment in every source of pleasure, of which they partake together. The constancy, the tenderness, the purity, the fervor of wedded love, finds repeated and varied exemplification. Canticles does not rise to the inculcation of monogamy nor assert for marriage that according to its primeval institution and its true idea it must be between one man and one woman. It alludes to polygamy, vi. 8, without disallowing or positively prohibiting it as an offence against the ordinance of God and the welfare of man. It belongs to a dispensation under which for the hardness of men's hearts this institution had been suffered to be clouded, and its original brightness dimmed. It issues no interdict against polygamy, but it undermines it. First, by drying up its source. It exhibits a style of intercourse between the sexes which is pure, elevated and refined, sensitive to the charms of beauty and of per-

Digitized by Google

sonal attractions, but without a trace of sensuality. There is no grossness, no impurity, no indelicacy even. Everything of that nature which has been attached to this gem of songs, should be laid to the account of mistranslation or misinterpretation. Secondly, by raising up an adversary too powerful for it. This Song depicts a mutual love which is absolutely exclusive, ii. 2, 16; iv. 12; vi. 3, 9; vii. 10; viii. 6, 7; and before which polygamy must fall, not because it is forbidden, but because it cannot be endured.

Greatly as we approve of ZÖCKLER's typical method of dealing with Canticles, we cannot accept what is peculiar in the typical views which he deduces from it. This follows, of course, from the exceptions we have taken to his literal conception of it, upon which it is based. Some may probably be shocked by the fact that he represents Shulamith as Solomon's superior in point of virtue and purity, and the instrument of working at least a temporary change for the better in him, while at the same time he says that Solomon and Shulamith are types of the Lord and His church. This, however, is not of itself sufficient to condemn his view. All types have their deficiencies. Some are deplorably defective, without after all ceasing to be types. There is a real foundation for what ZÖCKLER calls types of analogy and types of contrast, or as we have ourselves been in the habit of designating them, direct and inverse types, the former being objects which directly shadow forth the future good, and the latter such as stand in opposition to it or represent a want which it can supply. And in every individual type there are at the same time elements of correspondence with the ultimate ideal and of divergence from it, both of which must be taken into the account if its full lessons are to be unfolded.

If the question respected the typical character of Solomon on the whole, as a personage in the sacred History, it could not be objected that a more unfavorable view is taken of him than the facts recorded warrant. And it may be added that in the book of Ecclesiastes, which is inversely or negatively Messianic, the kingdom of Solomon is shown upon its unsatisfying side, in which it presents a marked contrast with that of his great antitype. We are now, however, solely concerned with Solomon as he is represented in the Song of songs. The typical, as the other lessons of the Song must be drawn from itself, without any such supplement at least from other sources as would distort the image presented here. A picture is presented to us belonging to the sphere of natural life; this must be simply transferred to the spiritual sphere to yield its typical or higher meaning. Features of Solomon's character which would have marred the significance or effect of the whole, may be neglected or lost sight of. They do not belong to the conception of this Song, which must be interpreted by itself.

Did the writer of this book intend anything more than the literal and ethical sense? ZÖCKLER thinks not. He supposes him to have composed this poem, setting forth this incident in the life of Solomon. He had no more in his mind than the human parties, the play of their affections, and the fond relation constituted between them. But the nature of the transaction itself, and the position of the principal actor in the sacred history impart to it a typical import, of which Solomon himself, in writing it, had no conception. Its connection with Solomon, and its ethical bearings in his view justify its place among the sacred oracles, even apart from its mystical meaning. This is a question of some difficulty. For, 1. It cannot be affirmed that the book itself contains any clear indication of its higher meaning; what has been adduced as showing that the writer intended something more profound than lies upon the surface, is mostly of doubtful interpretation, and is scarcely sufficient to produce conviction. 2. Such instances as Ruth, Esther, and many of the Proverbs may make us cautious in undertaking to determine in advance what amount of evident religious character is necessary to entitle a book to admission to the canon of the Old Testament. 3. The sacred historians in all probability were ignorant of the typical nature of much that they have recorded.

Nevertheless, we cannot but believe that the writer of this divine Song recognized the symbolical character of that love, which he has here embellished. The typical character of the king of Israel was familiarly known, as is apparent from many of the Psalms. The typical character of Solomon's own reign was well understood by himself, as appears from Psalm lxxii. That the Lord's relation to His people was conceived of as a marriage from the time of the covenant at Sinai, is shown by repeated expressions that imply it, in the law of Moses. That under these circumstances, the marriage of the King of Israel should carry the thoughts up by

Digitized by Google

a ready and spontaneous association to the covenant-relation of the King *par excellence* to the people, whom He had espoused to Himself, is surely no extravagant supposition, even if the analogous instance of Psalm xlv. did not remove it from the region of conjecture to that of established fact. The mystical use made of marriage so frequently in the subsequent scriptures, with evident and even verbal allusion to this Song, and the constant interpretation of both the Synagogue and the Church, show the naturalness of the symbol, and enhance the probability that the writer himself saw what the great body of his readers have found in his production. And whatever may be said apologetically of the sacredness of this book, if its inspired author intended it in its literal sense alone, it exalts it so prodigiously, and frees it so completely from every shadow of objection, to suppose him to have employed this symbol with some consciousness of its sacred meaning, that I cannot bring myself to believe that the wise King of Israel was so blind as some have imagined him to be. And I am not sure but the absence of the name of God, and of any distinctive religious expressions throughout the Song is thus to be accounted for that the writer, conscious of the parabolic character of what he is describing, felt that there would be an incongruity in mingling the symbol with the thing symbolized. See ISAAC TAYLOR's *Spirit of the Hebrew Poetry*, pp. 174, 5].

§ 5. HISTORY AND LITERATURE (BIBLIOGRAPHY) OF THE INTERPRETATION OF THE SONG OF SOLOMON.

*a. The allegorical attempts at explanation in ancient and modern times.**

It is as impossible to deny that the mystical and allegorical view of the Song of Solomon, which entirely disregards the literal sense, and sees nothing in it but an exhibition in a figurative dress, of the covenant-relation between Jehovah and Israel, or of the loving communion of Messiah with His Church, may have had advocates among the Jewish scribes before the close of the Old Testament canon, as it is to prove that this view was the only one in the period before Christ, or that it was the *conditio sine qua non* of the reception of the book into the canon. For neither the acquaintance which the author of Prov. i–ix, xxii.–xxiv betrays with it (see § 3, REM. 1), nor the frequent use made of it by the prophet Hosea at a somewhat later period (comp. Hos. xiv. 6-9 with Cant. ii. 1, v. 15, iv. 11, vi. 11, *etc.*), affords any certain proof that the allegorical explanation was already cultivated before the exile at the expense of the historical. That according to the tradition of the Talmud (see R. AZARIAS in *Meor Enaim*, p. 175 *b*), EZRA only admitted such books to the canon as "were composed by the prophets in the Holy Spirit," can no more be esteemed a historical testimony for the exclusive prevalence of the allegorical interpretation at the time of the collection of the canon, than the statement of the TARGUM on i. 1, that the Song of Songs was sung "by Solomon the prophet and king of Israel in the spirit of prophecy." Nor can any proof be brought from the Old Testament Apocrypha of the existence of the allegorical mode of interpretation before the time of Christ. The passages adduced for this purpose by ROSENMUELLER, Wisd. viii. 2, 9, 16, 18; Eccles. xxiv. 18, 19, by no means necessarily imply that the bride of the Canticles was taken to be the divine wisdom; and against the validity of the passage Eccles. xlvii. 15-17 urged by KEIL, even HENGSTENBERG has shown that Solomon's παροιμίαι, παραβολαί and ἑρμηνεῖαι, "proverbs, parables and interpretations" here extolled, simply refer to the proverbs and enigmatical sayings of the king mentioned, 1 Kin. v. 12 (iv. 32) ff., x. 1 ff., not to any mystical sense of this "Song of songs." Nor can the SEPTUAG. be adduced as representing the allegorical interpretation of this Song; for though it renders מֵרֹאשׁ אֲמָנָה iv. 8 by ἀπὸ ἀρχῆς πίστεως and כְּתִרְצָה by ὡς εὐδοκία, these are errors of translation, which only show that the two localities in question (Amana and Tirzah) were no longer known to the authors of the Alexandrian version. No certain traces of a use of the Song of Solomon in an allegorical sense can be pointed out even in the writings of PHILO; and the same is true of the New Testament, where, at the utmost Rev. iii. 20 might be regarded as an expression taken from the Song of Solomon, explained of

* Comp. in general ED. CUNITZ, Histoire Critique de l'interpretation du Cant. des Cantiques. *Strasburg*, 1834, [also the account given of preceding commentators in the commentaries of WILLIAMS, pp. 106–126, GINSBURG, pp. 20–102, MOODY STUART pp. 623–640, and THRUPP pp. 16–36, of which the translator has freely availed himself in such additions as he has thought it needful to make.]

Digitized by Google

the Messiah, but is more probably to be traced, like what is elsewhere said of Christ as the bridegroom of His Church (*e. g.* Mat. ix. 15, John iii. 29, *etc.*), to the corresponding ideas and expressions in the figurative language of the prophets in general.* Comp. § 4, p. 16, and in opposition to the different judgment expressed by HENGSTENBERG respecting these passages of the New Testament, comp. especially UMBREIT in *Herzog's Real Encyc.*, vol. vi. p. 207 f.

Accordingly, it is not until the period after Christ and His apostles that really unmistakable traces are found of the allegorical understanding and treatment of the Song of Solomon; and in the first instance in the way that the author of the fourth book of Esdras, an apocalyptic production of a Jewish Christian, written probably in the time of Domitian, uses the expressions "lily" and "dove," v. 24, 26, with unmistakable reference to Cant. ii. 1, vi. 9, as mystical designations of the Church of God. Then in an allegorical explanation of iii. 11, given by R. SIMON BEN GAMALIEL about the year 120 of the Christian era (see *Taanith*, IV. 8): and finally in the solemn asseveration of R. AKIBA, the celebrated contemporary of this R. SIMON (in *Yadaim* III. 5), that Canticles defiles the hands, and is to be regarded not only as a holy, but in comparison with the rest of the Hagiographa as a most holy book † (קדש קדשים). The Synagogue, from the first centuries of the Christian era, must have universally proceeded on the assumption attested by this declaration of a hidden allegorical sense to this book. For ORIGEN and JEROME testify that it was a universal custom among the Jews in their time, not to allow any one to study the Canticles, the account of the creation in Genesis (the מעשה בראשית) or the 1st chap. of the Prophet Ezekiel (the מעשה מרכבה) before the thirtieth year of his life. And IBN EZRA declares that it was an undoubted and undisputed fact that nothing in the Canticles was spoken literally, but all figuratively.‡

Great numbers of both Jewish and Christian interpreters have since treated the Song of Solomon in this one-sided allegorical method, which fritters away the historical sense altogether, and sets it aside as offensive. Of the former, the most ancient whose work has come down to us is the author of the TARGUM, which is at all events post-Talmudic. The model thus given was followed by most of the Rabbins of the middle ages, particularly RASHI, KIMCHI, and IBN EZRA, of Toledo, in the twelfth century, who has already been mentioned, and who sees in the book an allegorical and prophetical representation of the history of Israel from the time of Abraham (whilst the other rabbinical interpreters almost universally, like the TARGUMIST, make the action begin with the exodus from Egypt under Moses); likewise MOSES MAIMONIDES (†1204), who in his *More Nebochim*, explains some passages at least of the poem, and this in such a way that "its historical contents vanish entirely, and the mystical signification of its poetical and figurative expressions is alone of any worth." In the Church ORIGEN brought the mystical and allegorical mode of treatment into vogue, and by far the greatest number of the fathers and the theologians of the middle ages, and even of more recent times, have followed him, with however the subordinate variations that to the mystico-spiritual view represented by him, by JEROME, MACARIUS, THEODORET, BERNARD of Clairvaux, *etc.*, there have also been added in the course of time a mystico-doctrinal (CYPRIAN, ATHANASIUS, JOACHIM LANGE, RAMBACH, STARKE, *etc.*), a mystico-political or historical (AUGUSTIN, LUTHER), a mystico-prophetical (COCCEIUS, GULICH, HEUNISCH, REINHARDT, *etc.*), a mystico-Mariological (AMBROSE, RUPERT V. DEUTZ, DIONYSIUS CARTHUSIANUS, MICH. GHISLERIUS, SALMERON, CORNELIUS A

* [THRUPP remarks on the contrary: "It is indeed there never directly quoted; but, on the other hand, the passages in which its language and its imagery are in various ways embodied, are numerous; the use thus made of it is uniformly allegorical; the cumulative cogency of these repeated dependences upon it in favor of the allegorical interpretation becomes very great; and throughout the New Testament no hint is to be found that it bore or could bear any other than an allegorical meaning." The passages, which he cites in proof of this conclusion in his commentary pp. 53–55, are not all equally convincing; some are wholly fanciful. But enough remain to satisfy an unprejudiced mind that the inspired writers of the New Testament and our Lord Himself found a deeper meaning in this Song than appears upon its surface.—TR.]

† See the passage in J. D. MICHAELIS' Preface: "Absit omni modo ut qui Israelita negaret, quod canticum canticorum non polluat manus sive non sit sacrum; quia totus mundus tanti non est ac ille dies quo canticum canticorum Israeli est datum. Omnia enim Hagiographa sacra sunt, sed canticum canticorum est sacratissimum. Etsi qua de Salomonis scriptis dissensio fuit (*viz.*, whether they belong in the canon—comp. *Aboth de* RABBI NATHAN, c. 1 in DELITZSCH, *Hohel.*, p. 48), ea tantum de Ecclesiaste fuit."

‡ Præf., in Cant. Cantic.: "Absit, absit, ut canticum canticorum de voluptate carnali agat; omnia potius figurate in eo dicuntur. Nisi enim maxima ejus dignitas, inter libros Scripturæ sacræ relatum non esset; neque ulla de eo est controversia."

Digitized by Google

LAPIDE, *etc.*), and even a mystico-hieroglyphical (PUFENDORF and RUNGE, 1776). They are all agreed, however, that the whole poem was conceived by the author with a conscious allegorical design. The most recent allegorical expositors also occupy substantially the same ground, now inclining to one and now to another of these modifications; as ROSENMUELLER, HUG and KAISER have sought each in his own way to reproduce the mystico-historical or political method of explanation of former times; GOLTZ, the mystico-prophetical; H. A. HAHN, KEIL, O. v. GERLACH, HENGSTENBERG, the mystico-doctrinal; GUST. JAHN and others, the mystico-spiritual mode of explanation.

SPECIAL BIBLIOGRAPHY.

I. JEWISH ALLEGORICAL EXPOSITIONS.

TARGUM *in Cant. Canticorum* (contained in the TARGUM to the five Megilloth, *viz.*, Song of Solomon, Ruth, Lamentations, Esther, Ecclesiastes), best printed in the Paris and London polyglots. It betrays, by its references to the TALMUD, and even to the Mohammedans, that it was not composed until the eighth century probably, which, however, does not exclude a higher antiquity for many of its remarks and stories strung together in the style of the Haggada. It forms a continuous "picture of Israel's history from the exodus out of Egypt through the oppressions of the kingdoms of the world until his final redemption." "Draw me after thee" (i. 4), is explained of the march of the people under the conduct of Jehovah to Sinai; "Look not at me, because I am black" (i. 6) of the penitent confession of sin by those who had forsaken Jehovah for the golden calf; "Tell me, thou whom my soul loveth, where thou feedest," *etc.* (i. 7), of Moses' supplication for the transgressing people; the festive procession described in iii. 6–11 of the taking of the promised land by Joshua, and the building of Solomon's temple; the words (vii. 13) "let us go to the vineyards," *etc.*, of Israel praying for deliverance from the Babylonish exile; the "odorous mandrakes" (vii. 14) of the period of deliverance already come; and finally, the concluding verse (viii. 14) is explained as a petition to the Lord, that He would speedily bring back the scattered people to the "spice mountains," *i. e.*, to the temple mountain in Jerusalem, with its fragrant offerings of incense—all this is interwoven with gross anachronisms, strange leaps of thought, and extravagant fancies of every description; comp. ZUNZ, *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge der Juden, etc.*, p. 65 f.; DELITZSCH, *Hohel.*, p. 49; UMBREIT, *loc. cit.*, p. 208 f. [See the English translation of this TARGUM in GILL on Canticles, 1728, and in ADAM CLARKE's Commentary.]

RASHI (*i. e*, R. SOLOMON BEN ISAAC, † 1105), *Commentarius in libros historicos et Salomonis V. T., in Lat. vertit* J. FR. BREITHAUPT, 1714 (on the rabbinical editions of this Commentator, who is particularly valuable on account of his copious communications from older Jewish allegorical interpreters, comp. DE ROSSI, *Histor. Wörterbuch der Judischen Schriftsteller*, from the Italian, by HAMBERGER, 1839; also J. CHR. WOLF, *Bibliotheca Hebræa*, 1715–33, 4 vols.)

DAVID KIMCHI (son of JOSEPH KIMCHI, born at Narbonne, 1190, died after 1250), *Commentarius in Cantic. Canticor.* (in the rabbinical Bibles of Bomberg and Buxtorf; inclining to the literal interpretation of Scripture, yet setting the greatest store also by the older allegorizing tradition, especially in the exegesis of Messianic passages; comp. M. HEIDENHEIM in HERZOG's *Real-Encyklop.* XIX. 693).

IBN EZRA (†1167) *Commentar. in Cant. Cant.*, also in Bomberg's and Buxtorf's Bibles; differs from the TARGUM and most of the other rabbins in finding the history of Israel from the time of Abraham allegorically and prophetically represented in the Song of Solomon, and hence it is not until chap. ii. that he comes down to the times of Moses and the giving of the law; he sees, for example, in the voice of the bridegroom, "who comes leaping over mountains and hills," ii. 8, the thunder of Jehovah, by which Sinai was shaken (comp. Ps. xxix.), refers the "peeping of the bridegroom through the window" (ii. 9), to God's looking down upon His people oppressed in Egypt for their help, *etc., etc.*

MOSES MAIMONIDES († 1204) *Moreh Nebochim* seu *Doctor perplexorum*, ed. Jo. BUXTORF, 1629, comp. the Arabic and French edition "*le Guide des Egarés*," by S. MUNK, Par. 1856–61, 2 vols., explains in the first part of this work in addition to many other passages of the Old Test., which represent the divine under sensible images, various sentences from the Song of

Digitized by Google

Solomon, and in so doing returns to the extremely arbitrary and desultory method of the older Midrash which "at every verse or clause of a verse pours out a perfect cornucopia of the most heterogeneous thoughts and fancies," without aiming at any continuous historico-allegorical explanation of the whole. A characteristic specimen is afforded by the remark upon the opening words i. 2, where the "kiss of his mouth" is taken to be a mystical designation of the union of the Creator with the creature (*apprehensio Creatoris cum summo amore Dei conjuncta s Neshikah*), and the well-known phrase of the rabbins that Moses, Aaron and Miriam died "in the kiss of God" is traced back to this as its origin. Comp. BUXTORF's *Edit.* p. 523, and generally JOST, Art. "Maimonides" in HERZOG's *Encycl.* VIII. 691 ff.

MOSES BEN TIBBON, IMMANUEL BEN SALOMO the Roman, and other rabbinical adherents of the cabalistic and philosophical exegesis of the Jews of the middle ages differ from the common historico-allegorical interpretation in that Solomon is to them a symbol of the highest spiritual will (the *intellectus agens*), Shulamith a symbol of the lower, merely sensuous and receptive understanding (the *intellectus materialis*), and the whole is a representation of the union of both effecting the purification of the latter. On the contrary the religious poetry of the Jews of Spain in the *Pijut*, in so far as it is based on the Song of Solomon, rests on that more widely diffused allegorical view, which sees in Shulamith the "congregation of Israel" (כנסת ישראל). Comp. SACHS, *Relig. Poesie der Juden in Spanien*, p. 267; DELITZSCH, *Hohel.* p. 50.*

II. CHRISTIAN ALLEGORISTS.

a. The mystico-spiritual interpretation. (Regarding the whole as a figurative representation of the intercourse of Christ with the believing soul).

ORIGEN in *Cant. Canticorum Homiliæ duo* translated into Lat. by JEROME (see his *Opp.* ed. VALLARS. Vol. III., p. 500 ff.) is the founder of that method of interpretation which sees in the bride of the Canticles the soul pining for union with God, and in the bridegroom the divine love which sanctifies, purifies and elevates it to itself; he accordingly explains the whole in a moral-soteriological or mystico-psychological manner. Comp. what JEROME says in his translation: "*Canticum canticorum amorem cœlestium divinorumque desiderium incutit animæ sub specie sponsæ et sponsi, caritatis et amoris viis perveniendum docens ad consortium Dei.*"—In his more extended commentary in XII. τόμοι, of which only four books are still extant in the Latin translation of RUFIN (see *Origenis Opp.* ed. LOMMATZSCH, Vol. 14, 15) he had explained the bride of the Canticles by turns of the individual souls of Christians striving after union with Christ, and of the Church as the collective body of believers, thus combining the mystico-doctrinal with the mystico-spiritual interpretation; and yet through JEROME, who translated the former work only into Latin, and not the latter also, the mystico-spiritual interpretation was rendered almost exclusively influential as a model for later interpreters, particularly in the West.**

EUSEBIUS of Caesarea, *Comment. in Cant. Canticor.* (lost except a few questions).

MACARIUS the elder or the Egyptian († about 390) *Opera* ed. PRITIUS, Lips. 1699 (explains the Song of Solomon likewise of the loving intercourse of the soul with God).

[GREGORY of Nyssa, *In Cantica Canticorum Explanatio;* fifteen homilies continuing the exposition to the middle of the sixth chapter. "Of the two alternative interpretations of ORIGEN, that which identified the bride with the human soul is peculiar, as an exclusive interpretation, to the homilies of GREGORY of Nyssa."—THRUPP.]

THEODORETUS, *Interpretatio in Cantic. Canticorum*, *Opp.* Vol. II. ed. SCHULTZE, Hal. 1770. [" Of all the patristic comments on the Song those of THEODORET are the most valuable. They are executed with judgment, and with a careful but discriminating regard to the labors of earlier writers; are sufficiently full without being prolix; and have come down to us complete. In them Christ is the Bridegroom; the Bride is the Church, more especially as the

* On the bibliography of the Jewish expositions of the Song of Solomon in general comp. KLEUKER, *Sammlung der Gedichte Salomo's, etc.*, pp. 58-67, [also GINSBURG, *The Song of Songs*, pp. 24-60].

** The well-known comparison of the contents of the three books of Solomon, *viz.*, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and Canticles, to the philosophical triad ἠθική, φυσική and λογική (or θεωρική), which ORIGEN first suggested and JEROME adopted from him, also rests upon a mystico-spiritual sense of the Canticles. Comp. the Introduction to the Proverbs of Solomon, p. 1.

Digitized by Google

company of those who have been perfected in all virtues; those who have not yet reached the full degree of perfection being represented as the Bride's companions."—THRUPP.]

MAXIMUS CONFESSOR, *Paraphrasis in Cant. Canticorum* (in the Greek *Catenæ* to the O. Test. in FRONTO DUCAEUS, *Auctar. Bibl. Patr.* II. 681 ff. and in the *Bibl. Patr.* ed. MORELL, Vol. XIII.; comp. also the *Catena in Cant. Cantic.* by MEURSIUS, *Lugd. Batav.* 1617 †).

WILLIRAM (Abbot at Ebersberg in Bavaria † 1085) *Paraphrasis in Cant. Canticorum*, ed. MERULA, Lugd. Bat. 1598, and H. HOFFMANN, Bresl. 1827, gave a twofold paraphrase of the Song of Solomon, in which he followed the customary allegorical method, one in Lat. hexameters, the other in old high German prose, in both regarding the whole as a colloquy between Christ and the believing soul. The old high German treatise like NOTKER's somewhat older paraphrase of the Psalms is of great interest in the history of language. Comp. HOFFMANN in the German Edition already mentioned, as well as W. SCHERER, *Leben Willirams, etc.*, Vienna, 1866.

HONORIUS of Autun, *Expositio in Cantica Canticorum Salomonis*, in *Bibl. Patrum Lugdun.* Vol. XX. (the *Præfatio* especially important on account of its laying down the theory of the fourfold sense of Scripture, which the exposition of particular passages then seeks to point out everywhere, according especial prominence to the *sensus moralis*).

BERNARD of Clairvaux, *Sermones* 86 *Super Cant. Canticorum*, *Opp.* Vol. II. ed. *Venet.* (a diffuse mystico-practical exposition, which, however, only treats the first two chapters and the opening words of the third, and explains the whole of the soul seeking her heavenly bridegroom and introduced by Him first into the garden, then into the banquet hall, and finally into the sleeping chamber, sometimes, moreover, weaving in a doctrinal interpretation as on i. 2, where kissing with the kiss of His mouth is explained of the incarnation of Christ, this "condescending miracle of a kiss, in which not mouth is pressed to mouth but God is united with man," *etc.** The continuation of this gigantic work attempted by BERNARD's pupil, GILBERT v. HOYLAND, only carries it on to v. 10 in 58 discourses). Comp. also FERNBACHER: *die Reden des heil.* BERNHARD *über das Hohelied, deutsch bearbeitet* ["The Discourses of ST. BERNARD on the Canticles," rendered into German], Leipz. 1866.

RICHARD A. S. VICTORE, THOMAS AQUINAS, BONAVENTURA, GERSHON and others represent in their *Expositiones in Cantic. Canticorum* the same mystico-psychological explanation, according to which the Song of Solomon forms a compendium of the science of inward Christian experience, an inexhaustible mine of ideas and fancies as profound as they are arbitrary. ["AQUINAS is said to have dictated his commentary on his death-bed."]

TERESA DE JESUS, *Conceptos del amor de Dios sobra algunas palabras de los cantares de Salomon* ("Thoughts on the love of God suggested by some verses in Canticles)"—explains particularly the passages i. 2; ii. 3; ii. 4; ii. 5, *etc.*, of the marriage of the enraptured soul with the holy Trinity, or of the fourth and highest stage of her peculiar mystical theory of prayer; comp. my essay "TERESIA V. AVILA," *etc.*, in the *Zeitschr. f. Luth. Theol.* 1865, I. and II.

JUAN DE LA CRUZ (JOHN of the cross), *Cantico espiritual entre el alma e Christo su esposo* ("spiritual song between the soul and Christ its bridegroom"—a free poetic imitation of some of the principal passages of the Song of Solomon, especially from chap. iii.–vi.; comp. the essay already referred to in the *Zeitschr. f. Luth. Theol.* 1866, I., particularly p. 59 ff.).

[The commentary of the Spanish Jesuit, GASPAR SANCTIUS (or SANCHEZ), published in 1616, forms a quarto volume of nearly 400 pages, which is highly commended by MOODY STUART for its learning and research and the spirituality of its views.]

DELRIO, DELGADO, SOTOMAYOR, PINEDA, OROCZO. These and other Spanish mystics adopt the same allegorical method in their commentaries with those before named, explaining the "cheeks of the bride," iv. 3, of outward Christianity in good works; her slender neck, vii. 5, of the constancy of the love of Christ; her golden chains, i. 10, of faith; the silver points on the ornaments of gold, i. 11, of the holiness of the walk; the spikenard, i. 12, of redeemed

* His representation of the individual soul of the Christian as in some sort the bride of Christ is justified by BERNARD by a reference to the fact that individuals as members of the Church, which is the proper bride of the Lord, evidently have part in this common title of honor and in the blessings therewith connected. "*Quod enim simul omnes plene integreque possidemus, hoc singuli sine contradictione participamus.*" (Serm. XII.).

Digitized by Google

humanity; the bunch of myrrh, i. 13, of the passion of Christ; the "thorns about the rose," ii. 2, of temptations by tribulations, by all sorts of crimes or by heretics; the "chariots of Amminadab" of the devil, *etc.* Comp. C. A. WILKENS, FRAY LUIS DE LEON: *eine Biographie aus der Geschichte der Spanischen Inquisition und Kirche* (Halle, 1866), p. 206 ff.

JOHN MICH. DILLHERR, *Göttliche Liebesflamme oder Betrachtung unterschiedlicher Stellen des Hohenlieds* [Divine flame of love or a Consideration of divers passages in the Canticles], Nuremberg, 1640; also, *Annotationes in Canticum*, Wratislaw, 1680.

J. MARIE BOURRIERES DE LA MOTHE GUYON. *Le Cantique des Cantiques, interprété selon le sens mystique;* Grenoble, 1685. In this commentary, composed, according to her own confession, in one day and a half, but which was nevertheless commended by BOSSUET above her other writings, she closely resembles the preceding adherents of the mystico-spiritual interpretation, and seems particularly to have drawn from THERESA and ST. BERNARD.

[J. HAMON († 1687), *Explication du Cantique des Cantiques.* "Physician of Port Royal and continuator of the expositions of BERNARD."]

JOACHIM LANGE, RAMBACH, STARKE and others in the last century seek to connect as far as possible the mystico-doctrinal view of the Song of Solomon with the mystico-spiritual; comp. the following rubric, p. 31.

The BERLEBURG BIBLE (Berleb. 1726 ff.) pays less regard to the doctrinal view of the Song of Solomon or the explanation of the bride as the Church, than to the spiritual, according to which the conditions and stages of progress in the individual Christian life are represented in it.

GUSTAV JAHN, *Das Hohelied in Liedern* [Solomon's Song in Songs], Halle, 1848, divides the whole into 62 longer or shorter sonnets in which is sung 1) the work of faith; 2) the labor of love; 3) confirmation in grace; and 4) the yea and amen of the bride.

b. The Mystico doctrinal Interpretation. (Understanding the whole as a description of the relation between Christ and His Church).

ATHANASIUS, *Expositio in Cant. Canticorum* (now lost, but still known to PHOTIUS *Cod.* 139; preferred the explanation of the bride as the Church above that of making her to be the individual soul; so also the pseudo-Athanasian *Synopsis div. Scripturæ*, l. XVI).*

EPIPHANIUS, *Commentarius super Cant. Salomonis* ed. P. F. FOGGINI, Rom. 1750 (of doubtful authenticity, especially because the eighty concubines of Solomon, vi. 8, are here explained of dumb, *i. e.* non-prophesying spirits of the prophets, whilst EPIPHANIUS in his *Panarion* (l. III. p. 2) finds in those concubines the eighty heresies of Christendom prefigured. It is at all events very ancient, *e. g.* already attested by CASSIODORUS *de Inst. divin. liter. c.* 5, and is extremely rich in whimsical interpretations, as *e. g.*, that the winter, ii. 11, denotes the sufferings of Christ; the voice of the turtle-dove, ii. 12, the preaching of Paul, the former persecutor of the Christians, *etc.* Some would regard it as a work of BISHOP PHILO of Carpasus; see *e. g.* M. A. GIACOMELLI (*Philonis episc. Carpasii, enarratio in Cant. Canticorum, Romæ*, 1772). [It is evidently a breviary, or short expository compendium, mainly derived by the author from the writings of others; occasionally, as on iii. 6-8, containing a double exposition of the same passage. In it Christ is the Bridegroom, the Church the Bride."—THRUPP.]

CYRIL ot Jerusalem, *Catechesis XIV.*, *Opp.* ed. TOUTTÉE, Par., 1720 (explains the litter, iii. 9, of the cross of Christ; the silver of its feet of His betrayer's thirty pieces of silver; the purple of its cushion of the purple robe of the suffering Redeemer; Solomon's wedding crown of Christ's crown of thorns, *etc.*).

["Of the same spiritual kind was the general interpretation of the Christian Fathers; of BASIL, of GREGORY of Nazianzus, of even (as we learn from his scholar THEODORET) the literal interpreter DIODORE of Tarsus, of CHRYSOSTOM," *etc., etc.*—THRUPP.]

[POLYCHRONIUS DIACONUS, *Enarratio in Canticum Canticorum.*

CASSIODORUS, *Expositio in Cant. Cant.* Though passing under the name of CASSIODORUS, its authorship is doubtful and it may belong to a later date.

* In like manner CYPRIAN, who particularly refers the passage Cant. vi. 9 of preference to the Church as the one dove, *i. e.* the one chosen, beloved of Christ, *e. g.* Ep. 69 *ad Magnum*, c. 2; *de unit. Ecclesiæ*, c. 4.

Digitized by Google

JUSTUS ORGELITANUS (Bishop of Urgel in Catalonia, Spain, cir. A.D. 529), *In Cant. Cant. explicatio mystica.*

ISIDORUS HISPALENSIS, *Expositio in Cantica Canticorum.* For the titles of various commentaries of little note, belonging to the middle ages, see DARLING's *Cyclopædia Bibliographica* (Holy Scriptures), pp. 578 ff.—TR.]

["GENEBRAND, Bishop of Aix († 1597), a learned Benedictine, wrote two comments, a larger and smaller, both in the latter part of the sixteenth century; and his work is distinguished by collections from the Rabbins."—WILLIAMS.]

HIERON. OSORIUS (canon at Evora in Portugal about 1600): *Paraphrasis et Commentaria in Ecclesiasten et in Canticum Canticorum, Lugduni*, 1611 ("*mutuum Christi et Ecclesiæ amorem Salomon explicare volens, fœminæ et viri, mutuo se amantium, affectiones elegantissime descripsit*").

JOHN PISCATOR, *Commentarius in Proverbia Salomonis itemque Canticum Canticorum*, Herborn. 1647.

JOHN GERHARD, *Predigten über das Hohelied* [Sermons on the Song of Solomon] in his *Postilla Salomonea*, Jena, 1666, adopts the allegorical interpretation prevalent in the Church; so also A. CALOV in the "*Biblia illustrata*," as well as L. OSIANDER in his *Bibelwerk*, CARPZOV in his *Introductio in libb. V. T.*, J. H. MICHAELIS in his *Annotatt. in Hagiogr.* Vol. II., JOACH. LANGE in the *Salomonische Licht und Recht*, BUDDEUS, WILISCH and many others.

STARKE, (*Synopsis*, Part IV.) closely follows those last mentioned in seeing in the Song of Solomon "a treatise, in which the union of Christ with believers is set forth under the emblem of the most tender love of a bridegroom and bride," or in some sense also a "prophetical book," in which (without chronological order) is represented: "the coming of Messiah in the flesh, the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, the gathering of the N. Test. Church from Jews and Gentiles, as well as the special trials and leadings of the Church," *etc.*).

MAGN. FR. ROOS, "*Fussstapfen des Glaubens Abrahams*" [Footsteps of the faith of Abraham], St. 5, 1773 (the bridegroom is Christ, the bride the Church, the daughters of Jerusalem and the queens, concubines and virgins mentioned in vi. 8 represent the various classes of believers; the whole describes the loving intercourse of Christ with His people in this world, *etc.;* comp. further particulars in DELITZSCH, *Hohel.* pp. 58–61).

O. v. GERLACH, *das Alte Test., etc.*, Vol. III., 1849. The whole "portrays the various advances and estrangements conducting ever to a more perfect union in the love of Jehovah or Christ and His Church, yet not in the form of a regularly unfolding history but in certain significant transactions, which though related to each other are without any close connection." In the explanation of the details much uncertainty and capricious vacillation.

K. F. KEIL, *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in's A. T.* [Historico-critical Introduction to the O. Test.], 1853, finds as already in HAEVERNICK's *Introduction*, Part III., edited by him, "under the allegory of the conjugal love of Solomon and Shulamith" the loving communion between the Lord and His Church, depicted according to its ideal nature, which results from the selection of Israel to be the people of the Lord.

HENGSTENBERG, *das Hohelied Salomonis ausgelegt*, [the Song of Solomon Expounded], Berl., 1853, makes the only correct "spiritual interpretation" of the Song of Solomon to lie in this that the "heavenly Solomon" must be distinguished from Solomon, the earthly author of the Song, as the object of its descriptions; and the beloved of this heavenly Solomon must be confessed to be the "daughter of Zion," and the whole, therefore, like the 45th Psalm, which is a sort of "compendium of the Song of Solomon," must be allegorically explained of the Messiah and His Church in the Old and the New Test. In the details there is much that is trifling and arbitrary; *e. g.* the hair of Shulamith compared with a flock of goats, iv. 1, signifies the mass of the nations converted to the Church of the Lord; the navel of Shulamith, vii. 3, denotes "the cup from which the Church refreshes the thirsty (*i. e.* those longing for salvation) with a noble and refreshing draught;" the sixty and eighty wives of Solomon point to the admission of "the original gentile nations into the Church," because 140 or seven multiplied by two and by ten forms the "signature of the Covenant," and because in the formation of his household from

Digitized by Google

women of the most diverse nations Solomon's purpose was directed "to a symbolic prefiguration of the kingdom of Christ," p. 169, and so on.

H. A. HAHN, *das Hohelied von Salomo, übersetzt und erklärt* [The Song of Solomon, translated and explained], Bresl., 1852, explains the Song of Solomon as setting forth under a dramatic dress and in the course of six acts, the fundamental thought that "the kingdom of Israel is called to vanquish heathendom finally with the weapons of righteousness and love, and to conduct it back again to the peaceful rest of a loving communion with God." According to this, therefore, Shulamith is a representative of heathendom, and particularly of Japhetic heathendom; and her younger sister, viii. 9 ff., corresponds to Hamitic heathendom, which is at last also to be converted too.

G. HOELEMANN, *Die Krone des Hohenlieds* [The crown of the Song of Solomon], Leipz. 1856, approaches most nearly to the view of HENGSTENBERG, only he avoids the too specific explanation of minute details and declares it inadmissible—comp. below, p. 43.

c. The Mystico-political or Mystico-historical Interpretation. (This differs from the preceding mainly in that it understands by the bride not the Church but the theocracy of the Old Test., and consequently approximates more to the Jewish allegorical explanation).

AUGUSTIN, *de Civit. Dei*, l. XVII. c. 8, 13, 20 (ed. BENED. Tom. VII., p. 714 ff.), refers the relation of the two lovers to the theocracy in the Old Test. and its fortunes.

LUTHER, *Brevis enarratio in Cantica Canticorum*, Opp. ed. Erlang. Vol. XXI., explains—herein differing from many other expressions, in which he adopts the common mystico-doctrinal interpretation—the bride to be the Old Test. theocracy in Israel at the time of its greatest splendor, and makes the whole a eulogy by Solomon of this his kingdom. "*Est enim encomium politiæ, quæ temporibus Salomonis in pulcherrima pace floruit. Quemadmodum enim in S. Scriptura, qui scripserunt Cantica, de rebus a se gestis ea scripserunt,** *sic Salomon per hoc poëma nobis suam politiam commendat, et quasi encomium pacis et præsentis status reipublicæ instituit in quo gratias Deo agit pro summo illo beneficio, pro externa pace, in aliorum exemplum, ut ipsi quoque sic discant Deo gratias agere, agnoscere beneficia summa, et orare, si quid minus recte in imperio acciderit, ut corrigatur*" (p. 278). "*Constituit Deum sponsum et populum suum sponsam, atque ita canit, quantopere Deus populum illum diligat, quot et quantis beneficiis eum afficiat et cumulet, denique ea benignitate et clementia eundem complectatur ac foveat, qua nullus unquam sponsus sponsam suam complexus est ac fovit*" (p. 276).†

[JOHN BRENTIUS, the Suabian reformer, adopted the same theory. GINSBURG quotes from his 32d homily the following language respecting the Song of Songs: "*Carmen encomiasticum, quod de laude regni et politiæ suæ Solomon conscripsit.*"]

LEON. HUG, "*Das Hohelied in einer noch unversuchten Deutung,*" [The Song of Solomon in a hitherto unattempted explanation], 1813, and "*Schutzschrift für seine Deutung des Hohenliedes und desselben weitere Erläuterung*" [Defence of his explanation of the Song of Solomon and its further elucidation]. 1815 sees in the bride the kingdom of the ten tribes, in the bridegroom king Hezekiah of Judah designated as Solomon, in the brothers of Shulamith, viii. 8, 9, a party in the house of Judah, in the whole a representation clothed in idyllic form of the longing felt by the kingdom of the ten tribes for reunion with Judah but which those "brothers" opposed. Comp. in opposition to this allegorical explanation favored only by HERBST in WELTE'S *Einl. in's A. T.* [Introduction to the Old Test.], EWALD, p. 40.

KAISER, "*Das Hohelied, ein Collectivgesang auf Serubabel, Esra und Nehemia, als die Wiederhersteller einer jüdischen Verfassung in der Provinz Juda*" [Canticles, a collective song respecting Zerubbabel, Ezra and Nehemiah as the restorers of a Jewish constitution in the province of Judah], 1825, a peculiar politico-allegorical explanation, which is wrecked by the

* He here has in mind Moses as the author of Ex. xv.; Deborah, Judg. v.; Hannah, 1 Sam. ii., *etc.*

† By his own confession LUTHER leaned in this peculiar explanation upon the Emperor MAXIMILIAN'S "*Theuerdank,*" as well as on like "*carmina amatoria principum, quæ vulgus accipit de sponsa aut amica cantata, cum tamen politiæ et populi sui statum his depingant.*" He engages in zealous polemics against the allegorical explanation common in the Church, "*de conjunctione Dei et synagogæ,*" and says at the close, in justification of his attempt at a new explanation: "*quod si erro, veniam meretur primus labor. Nam aliorum cogitationes longe plus absurditatis habent.*"

Digitized by Google

untenable character of its historical basis alone, altogether apart from the artificial and arbitrary nature of much beside that it contains.

ROSENMUELLER, "*Ueber des Hohenliedes Sinn und Auslegung* [On the meaning and interpretation of the Song of Solomon] in KEIL'S *und* TZSCHIRNER'S *Analekten*, Part I., Art. 3, 1830, seeks to establish anew the old Jewish allegorical explanation of the Song of the relation of Jehovah to His people, with reference to the analogy brought forward by Jones: "On the mystical poetry of the Persians and Hindoos" (in the *Asiatic Researches*, Vol. III.) with the Gitagovinda and the religious poetry of the Soofees—which analogy, however, is more apparent than real, and proves nothing for the far older Song of Solomon; (comp. EWALD, p. 38 ff.; DELITZSCH, p. 66 ff.).

d. The mystico-prophetic or Chronological Interpretation. (Regarding the Song of Solomon as a prophecy of the development of the Church in its several periods, as a sort of Apocalypse, therefore, or as a prophetic compendium of the history of the Church and of heretics).

APONIUS, *Expositio Cant.* lib. VI., of the seventh century; takes the Song of Solomon to be a continuous picture of the history of revelation from the creation to the final judgment. ["A sentence near the opening of his commentary has apparently induced the assertion that he follows the Chaldee in viewing the Song as of a historico-prophetical character. An inspection of the commentary will show that it contains no trace of the influence of the Chaldee, and that it is not more historico-prophetical than the commentaries of the earlier Christians. APONIUS finds in viii. 1, 13 an indication of the ultimate conversion of the Jews after much suffering; but the germ of a corresponding interpretation of other passages may be traced also in CASSIODORUS."—THRUPP.]

NICOLAUS DE LYRA, *Postilla in universa Biblia* finds represented in chaps. i.–vi. the history of Israel from Moses to Christ, in chap. vii. and viii. that of Christianity to the time of CONSTANTINE.

G. EDERUS, JACOBUS DE VALENTIA, *etc.* (see on these and other advocates of the chronological explanation of COCCEIUS, DELITZSCH, p. 56 f.). [The Spanish prelate, JAMES PEREZ of Valentia (1507), "instead of dividing the Song into Old Testament and New Testament portions, viewed it as setting forth throughout, primarily the different phases of Old Testament history, and then also under the figure of these and simultaneously with them the mysteries of redemption. He divides the Song into ten separate canticles, commencing respectively i. 2; i. 12; ii. 8; iii. 6; iv. 1; iv. 16; v. 8; vi. 1; vii. 13. "Return, return, *etc.*; viii. 5. These severally delineate the promises to the patriarchs; the construction of the tabernacle; the speaking of God from the tabernacle; the carrying of the ark through the wilderness with attendant miracles; Moses' ascent of Pisgah; the death of Moses; the entrance into Canaan; the conquest and partition of Canaan; the conflicts and victories under the Judges; and the prosperity and peace under Solomon. The corresponding events typified by them are the general expectations of the Old Testament saints; the incarnation of Christ; His teaching; His earthly career and miracles; His going up to Jerusalem; His death; the gathering into the Church of the first Jewish converts; the mission of the apostles to the Gentiles; the conflicts and victories of the martyr church; and the prosperity and peace under Constantine." "EDER, rector of the University of Vienna (1582), divided the Song into ten dramas, on the same principle apparently as PEREZ."—THRUPP.]

JOHN COCCEIUS, *Cogitationes de Cantico Canticorum Salomonis*, Opp. ed. Amsterd., 1673, II. vols. finds, vi. 9, the contest of the Guelphs and Ghibellines; vii. 5 (in the comparison of the bride with the pools at Heshbon the weeping Church of the 15th century as the period of laborious struggle for the reformation of the Church by the great reformatory councils; vii. 6 ff. Luther in his conflict with the degenerate courts of the 16th century; vii. 11 the capture of the elector John Frederick at Mühlberg, *etc., etc.*)

GROENEWEGEN, GULICH, REINHARD and other followers of COCCEIUS attach themselves closely to the preceding; so also partially at least

JOHN MARCK, *In Cant. Canticorum Salomonis commentar.*, Amstel., 1703.

Digitized by Google

CASP. HEUNISCH (Luth.) *Commentarius apocalypticus in Cant. Canticorum*, 1688, finds, as COCCEIUS had already done, seven periods of the church represented in the Song of Solomon, corresponding with the seven apocalyptic epistles, the seventh of which depicted in chap. viii., is to begin in the year A. D., 2060.

G. F. G. GOLTZ, *Das Hohelied Salomonis, eine Weissagung von den letzten Zeiten der Kirche Jesu Christi:* [The Song of Solomon, a prophecy of the last times of the Church of Jesus Christ], Berl., 1850, regards in the interest of Irvingite speculations the Song of Solomon as a prophetical book, which sets forth the final fortunes of the Church, "shortly before, during and after the second coming of Christ," and accordingly describes, *e. g.*, in ch. iii. the restoration of the original apostolic constitution of the Church, *etc.*

e. The Mystico-Mariological Interpretation. (Conceiving Shulamith to be identical with Mary, the mother of God.)

AMBROSE, *Sermo de virginitate perpetua S. Mariæ*, Opp. ed. Paris, 1642, Vol. IV, explains in addition to the "shut gate" Ezek. xliv., many passages of the Song of Solomon likewise, especially that of the "locked garden" and the "sealed fountain" iv. 12 of the perpetual virginity of Mary.

[GREGORIUS MAGNUS, *Expositio super Cantica Canticorum.* MOODY STUART says: "The two most distinctive features in his exposition are a great expression of desire for the conversion of the Jews in expounding the passage 'I brought him into my mother's house,' which he interprets of ancient Israel; and the introduction of the Virgin Mary into the song, but it is only to the effect that 'the crown wherewith his mother crowned him' was the humanity which Christ derived from Mary."

MICHAEL PSELLUS, Junior, in the eleventh century "wrote a metrical paraphrase and a prose commentary on the Canticles" in Greek. MOODY STUART says of it: "The Virgin Mary is brought in most fully and zealously; and to the writer nothing can be more clear than that she is 'the dove and the only one' in contrast to the surrounding multitude of queens and princesses."

"A similar view is taken of Cant. vi. 8, 9 in western literature by the ABBOT LUCAS, the epitomizer of Aponius." THRUPP.]

RUPERT V. DEUTZ, *in Cant. Canticorum, ll.* VII., carries out this suggestion of AMBROSE in a continuous exegesis of the entire book.

DIONYSIUS CARTHUSIANUS, GULIELMUS PARVUS, MICHAEL GHISLERIUS, SALMERON refer according to the hermeneutical rule of the threefold sense, all that is said of the spouse in the Song of Solomon: 1. To the Church; 2. To the individual believing soul; 3. To the holy Virgin.

CORNELIUS A LAPIDE, *Commentarii in V. T.*, Venet., 1730 ff., as the foregoing, only he makes the explanation of the holy Virgin to be the *sensus principalis.** [GINSBURG remarks that "he was the first who endeavored to show that this song is a drama in five acts." The themes of these five parts are stated by THRUPP to have been respectively "the infancy of the Christian church, its conflicts with the heathen power, its establishment under Constantine, its sufferings from heresy, and its renovation under the later Fathers."]

f. The Mystico-hieroglyphic Interpretation. (Conceiving the figurative language of Canticles to have been the offspring of some esoteric doctrine or Egyptian hieroglyphical wisdom of Solomon.)

V. PUFENDORF (Vice-president), "*Umschreibung des Hohenliedes, oder die Gemeine mit Christo und den Engeln im Grabe*" [Paraphrase of the Song of Solomon or communion with Christ and the angels in the grave] edited by RUNGE, 1776. The object described is supposed to be the participation of the believers of the Old and New Test. in the grave and death of the Saviour, in which also their desire for His appearing is likewise represented, and the future of

* The view of Shulamith as the hypostatical wisdom taken by LEO HEBRAEUS (*de amore dial.* c. 3), by J. G. ROSENMUELLER (*Scholia in V. T.*), and suggested likewise by DELITZSCH (*Hohelied*, p. 65 ff.), is akin to this mariological explanation; and with this again, that of the Rabbis MOSES BEN TIBBON, IMMANUEL BEN SOLOMON, *etc.*, is closely related, who make Shulamith the *intellectus materialis* (comp. above, p. 28.)

Digitized by Google

the Church until the general resurrection is prophetically prefigured. The "virgins" (עֲלָמוֹת i. 3; vi. 8, *etc.*, are the "pure and chaste souls shut up in the dark grave and waiting for the light," because they are so denominated from עָלַם "to be hidden," *etc.*, *etc.*

KISTEMAKER (Cath. clergyman) *Cantic. Canticorum illustratum ex hierographia orientali*, 1818, agreeing in method with the preceding, but in results with the common interpretation of the synagogue and the church, according to which the bride is the people of God.

["*Cantica Canticorum chymice explicata* is the title of a book in the library of the British Museum, but the book itself in the lapse of years has gone astray; and we can form no conjecture of its contents except from the words of CARPZOVIUS, that the Alchymists dream that under the shadow of his words Solomon has delineated (in the Song) the whole secret concerning the philosopher's stone." MOODY STUART.]

§ 6. CONTINUATION.

b. *The profane-erotic or one-sided Interpretations of the Song as secular history.*

That many of the most ancient Christian interpreters regarded Canticles as a Song of worldly love portraying voluptuous and sensual images, is attested by PHILASTRIUS, bishop of Brescia, († about 390) who adduces this view in his list of heresies as one of the heresies of his time. THEODORET († 457), who combats the same opinion, already enumerates several modifications of it. According to one, Shulamith was some bride or concubine of Solomon's, according to another Pharaoh's daughter, 1 Kings iii. 1, according to another still Abishag of Shunem. Among the adherents of this profane-erotic exegesis, THEODORET had doubtless in his eye THEODORE of Mopsuestia († 429), the well-known advocate of a strictly literal method of interpreting Scripture in the sense of the liberal theology of Antioch, and who was reproached by one of his later antagonists, LEONTIUS of Byzantium, for having interpreted the Canticles "*libidinose pro sua mente et lingua meretricia*," and whose commentary, therefore, together with the rest of his works, was ecclesiastically anathematized by the fifth ecumenical council in the time of the emperor Justinian (553), and has in consequence been lost. During the middle ages this profane mode of explanation entirely ceased even among the theologians of Judaism.* And subsequently in the period of the reformation the reformed humanist, SEBASTIAN CASTELLIO (1544), was the first to venture again to explain the Song as a "*colloquium Salomonis cum amica quadam Sulamitha*," and on account of this alleged purely worldly character to demand that it should be banished from the canon of Scripture, which led to his own speedy banishment from Geneva, at the instance of CALVIN.** In the following century HUGO GROTIUS trod partly at least in his footsteps, who, it is true, theoretically admitted the propriety of a typical and allegorical Messianic interpretation, but in fact continued to stand by a one-sided literal and pretty profane interpretation; also RICHARD SIMON, the well-known free-thinker of the oratorio, to whom the book appeared to be an anthology of erotic pieces of poetry without order or connection—whilst others went further and either warned against reading the book as a publication injurious to morality (SIMON EPISCOPIUS), or thought they must see in it a mere idyl, an eclogue with coarse comparisons like those of Polyphemus in OVID's *Metamorphoses* (JOHN CLERICUS). Then, soon after SEMLER's and J. D. MICHAELIS' attempts to prove, in a critical way, the impossibility of an allegorical or in general of any spiritual and Messianic view, the eighteenth century brought the beginning of that splintering or crumbling process initiated by LESSING and HERDER (see § 1, Rem. 2), as well as the modern-drama mode of understanding it, the way for which was paved by J. C. JACOBI, V. AMMON, KELLER and others, both resting on the assumption that the contents of the book were decidedly secular and erotic, and both cultivated and variously modified by numerous partisans, scientific and unscientific, down to the most recent times. And then

* Yet the party combated by KIMCHI in his Commentary on account of his assertion that Canticles was a Song of worldly love composed by Solomon in his youth, may possibly have been a rabbi of an earlier period in the middle ages. Comp. EICHHORN, *Repertorium*, Part XII., p. 283.

** [HENRY, the biographer of CALVIN, gives a full account of this whole affair, *Das Leben Johann Calvins*, Vol. II., pp. 384–390. He affirms that CASTELLIO withdrew of his own accord from Geneva, and was not banished from the place nor sent away in disgrace. CALVIN, though obliged to express his disapproval of his views, conducted himself with great leniency towards CASTELLIO personally, and gave him on his departure kindly letters to his friends.—TR.]

Digitized by Google

especially in the dramatic mode of understanding it, besides the assumption of a simple action with but one love in the case (so in particular WEISSBACH), various hypotheses of a more complicated sort are in vogue, according to which two (UMBREIT, EWALD, *etc.*, and generally speaking the majority) or even three pairs of lovers (HITZIG, RENAN) come upon the stage.

SPECIAL BIBLIOGRAPHY.

I. THE OLDER PROFANE-EROTIC INTERPRETERS.

(Until the middle of the 18th century, all proceeding from the simple assumption, that the poem sings of but one loving relation, *viz.*, that between Solomon and Shulamith.)

THEODORE of Mopsuestia (see on his *Commentarius in Cant. Canticorum*, which is unfortunately entirely lost: LEONTIUS of Byzantium, *adversus Nestorianos et Eutychianos, in* GALLANDII *Bibliotheca Patrum*, Vol. XII., and comp. the monographs of SIEFFERT (1827), FRITZSCHE (1836), KLENER and others). ["In the fifth century THEODORE of Mopsuestia ventured on asserting that the bride of the Song of Songs was none other than the Egyptian princess whom Solomon espoused. Whether or no any relics of the interpretation had been traditionally preserved in the East, we find the Jacobite primate ABUL-FARAJ († 1286) allowing in his Arabic history the Song to be outwardly a dialogue between Solomon and Pharaoh's daughter. Otherwise the name of Pharaoh's daughter has not been traced in connection with the Song till the occurrence of a reference to her, though even then 'merely in passing,' in some of the first printed English Bibles in the sixteenth century. [See note to p. 9.] The assertion of DAVIDSON and others after him that she makes her appearance in ORIGEN is most improbable; and after a careful search I feel assured that it is incorrect. I may add that PEREZ unjustly charges the ancient Jews with asserting that the Song was written in praise of her." THRUPP. MOODY STUART says to the same purport: "There may have been oversight on our part, but we have not found in any of these ancient authors [from ORIGEN to BERNARD] the remotest allusion to Pharaoh's daughter, and must confess ourselves quite baffled in a somewhat laborious attempt to trace her introduction into the Song of Solomon."]

SEBAST. CASTELLIO, *Psalterium reliquaque sacrarum literarum carmina cum argumentis et brevi locorum difficiliorum declaratione*, Basil, 1547, labors in general to dress up the contents of Holy Scripture in Latin as classical and smooth as possible, and hence everywhere substitutes *respublica* for *ecclesia*, *heroës* for *sancti*, *genius* for *angelus*, *Phœbus* for *sol*; *Jupiter* or even *Gradivus*, *Armipotens* for *Deus*, *lotio* for *baptismus*, *etc.*, and in Canticles in particular makes use of sugary fondling and softly expressions to characterize its amatory contents, *e. g.*, i. 14 f. "*Mea columbula ostende mihi tuum vulticulum. Fac ut audiam tuam voculam, nam et voculam venustulam et vulticulum habes lepidulum,*" ii. 15: "*capite nobis vulpeculas, vinearum vastatriculas,*" *etc.*—He had already in Geneva, shortly before his exile noted in his Bible at Cant. vii. 1 the words "*Sulamitha, amica Salomonis et sponsa,*" and had declared orally to CALVIN: "*que Salomon, quand il fit le chapitre vii, était en folie et conduit par mondanité et non par le Saint Esprit*"—for which reason CALVIN, without further ado, charged him with the view that Canticles was a "*carmen obscœnum et lascivum, quo Salomo impudicos suos amores descripserit.*"—Comp. also his complete Latin translation of the Bible: *Biblia V. et N. T. ex versione* SEB. CASTALIONIS *c. ejusd. annotatt.*, Basil. ap. Oporin., 1551, and frequently; as well as SEB. CASTALIONIS, *defensio suarum translationum Bibliorum*, Bas., 1562; finally his biography by JAC. MAEHLY, Bas., 1863.)

HUGO GROTIUS, *Annotationes in V. T.*, Par. 1664 (declares the Song of Solomon to be an idyl-like *carmen nuptiale*, representing the "*garritus conjugum inter se, Salomonis et filiæ regis Ægypti, interloquentibus etiam choris duobus tam juvenum quam virginum, qui in proximis thalamo locis excubabant.*" "*Nuptiarum arcana*" he says further, "*sub honestis verborum involucris hic latent; quæ etiam causa est, cur Hebræi veteres hunc librum legi noluerint nisi a jam conjugio proximis.*" Besides the *sensus literalis*, the *allegoricus* and *typicus* are also to be duly regarded—a rule, however, which is almost entirely disregarded by him even in the main controlling passages. Comp. the still bolder and more open procedure of S. EPISCOPIUS in his *Institutiones Theologiæ*.

Digitized by Google

RICHARD SIMON, *Histoire Critique du V. T.*, 1685, Vol. I. c. 4; Canticles, a collection of erotic idyllic songs, without order or unity.

JOHN CLERICUS, *Commentarius in V. T.*, Tübing., 1733 ff.

II. LATER AND LATEST SINCE THE MIDDLE OF THE 18TH CENTURY.

a. The founders of the modern profane erotic view (adhering in the first instance only to the more general results of the negative criticism).

JOHN SOLOMON SEMLER, "*Kurze Vorstellung wider die neue Paraphrasin über das Hohelied*" [Brief remonstrance against the new paraphrase of the Song of Solomon], 1757, and "*De mysticæ interpretationis studio hodie parum utili*," 1760.

JOHN DAVID MICHAELIS, *in Rob. Lowth. prælectiones de s. poësi Hebræorum notæ et epimetra*, Gœtting., 1758; ed. II, 1768 f., rejects, nay ridicules the allegorical interpretation as well of the Church as of the Synagogue; holds the poem to be a mere earthly love-song, and nevertheless supposes that he can relieve or remove the offence of its standing in the canon by seeking to understand its amatory contents of the "*casti conjugum amores*," instead of "*de sponso sponsaque ante nuptias*." In the "*Neuorientalische und exeget. Bibliothek*," Part IV, 1788, he affirms that he would rather venture upon the explanation of the Apocalypse than upon that of the Song of Solomon, and in his "*Deutsche Uebersetzung des A. T. mit Anmerkungen für Ungelehrte*" [German translation of the O. Test., with remarks for the unlearned] 1769 ff. he leaves it out entirely.

b. The Divisive attempts or fragmentary hypotheses. (Canticles, a conglomerate of erotic songs and fragments of songs).

J. TH. LESSING, *Eclogæ regis Salomonis*, Lips. 1777, compares the alleged idyls of Canticles to those of Theocritus and Virgil.

J. G. HERDER, "*Lieder der Liebe, die ältesten und schönsten aus dem Morgenlande*" [Songs of love, the oldest and most beautiful of the Orient], 1778, declares the love depicted in Canticles to be essentially pure and innocent, to be compared with the love of Adam and Eve, whilst they continued naked and sinless in paradise, and censures the profane mode of treating it equally with the allegorical explanation as hypocrisy, and lacking in moral and esthetic purity. (Comp. UMBREIT, in HERZOG's *Real Enc.* VI. p. 215: "All the lily purity and the full fragrance of the Song has been transferred to his composition, which is in entire sympathy with it, and even the *clare-obscure*, which is elsewhere made an objection to this extraordinary man, is here an advantage to him as an interpreter; the rosy morning light, which is spread over the Song itself, floats likewise over his exposition, and invests it with its very peculiar charm and fascination. To this belongs even his profound and delicate distribution of the whole into separate voices, accordant only in the breath of love, though here we cannot agree with him," *etc.*)

J. G. EICHHORN, *Einleitung in's A. T.* [Introduction to the O. Test.] Vol. III. Leipzig, 1780, ff., agrees in all essential matters with HERDER's esthetically-sublimating and critically-dissecting view: so HUFNAGEL, in EICHHORN's *Repertorium*, VII, 199; PAULUS and VELTHUSEN, *ibid.*, XVII, 108 ff. (see above, § 1, Rem. 1); JAHN, *Einl. in's A. T.* II. p. 816 ff.; PAREAU, *Institutio interpretis V. T.*, p. 559; DE WETTE, *Einleitung in die Kanon. und Apokryph. Büch. des A. T.*, Berl., 1817, and repeatedly; AUGUSTI, *Grundriss einer Hist.-Krit. Einl.* [Outlines of a historico-critical Introduction], 1806, 1827.

J. F. KLEUKER, *Sammlung der Gedichte Salomo's, sonst das Hohelied genannt* [Collection of the Songs of Solomon, otherwise called the Canticles], 1780, reproduces the view of HERDER with slight modifications, only somewhat more learned and thorough; comp. § 1, Rem. 1.

J. CHR. DÖDERLEIN, *Salomo's Prediger und Hoheslied neu übersetzt mit Anmerkungen* [Solomon's Ecclesiastes and Canticles, newly translated, with remarks], 1784; 2d edit., 1792, likewise adheres most strictly to HERDER.

VELTHUSEN, "*Der Schwesternhandel, eine morgenländische Idyllenkette*" [The affair of the sisters, a series of oriental idyls], 1786, and: "*Amethyst, Beitrag hist.-kritischer Untersuchungen über das Hohelied*" [Amethyst; a contribution to the historico-critical investi-

Digitized by Google

gation of Canticles] Brunsw., 1786; likewise: *Cantilena Cantilenarum Salomonis duplici interpretatione illustrata*, Helmst., 1786.

J. F. GAAB, *Beiträge zur Erklärung des sog. Hohenliedes und der Klagelieder* [Contributions to the explanation of the so-called Canticles and the Lamentations], Tüb., 1795; Canticles an "anthology" of erotic songs.

JUSTI, *Blumen alt-hebräischer Dichtkunst* [Flowers of the ancient Hebrew art of poetry], Giessen, 1807.

J. C. DÖPKE, *Philologisch-kritischer Commentar zum Hohenliede Salomo's*, Leipz., 1829, holds that the songs forming the Canticles, "many of which appear in a mutilated condition, were not originally composed and committed to writing at the same time, but were prepared on various occasions, probably preserved in the mouth of the people, and afterwards put together." Comp. in opposition UMBREIT's review in the *Stud. und Krit.*, 1829, II.

ED. ISID. MAGNUS, *Kritische Bearbeitung und Erklärung des Hohenliedes Salomo's* [Critical treatise on and explanation of the Song of Solomon], Halle, 1842, makes out no less than twenty distinct songs and fragments of songs in the course of the poem; comp. § 1, Rem. 2, as well as DELITZSCH, p. 2 ff.

HEILIGSTEDT, in MAURER's *Commentarius grammaticus criticus in V. T.* IV, 2, 1848, regards the whole as a combination of twelve erotic songs in one idyl; comp. § 1, Rem. 3.

REBENSTEIN, *Das Lied der Lieder* [The Song of Songs], 1834.

DAN., SANDERS, *Das Hohelied Salomonis* [The Song of Solomon] Leipz. 1866. Comp. on this modern Jewish attempt at exposition, as well as on the preceding, which serves as its basis and model, § 1, Rem. 2, and DELITZSCH, p. 6 f.

E. W. LOSSNER, *Salomo und Shulamith, die Blumen des Hohenlieds zu einem Strausse gebunden* [Solomon and Shulamith, the flowers of the Canticles tied together in one nosegay], Leipz. 1851 (comp. likewise § 1, Rem. 2).

c. The modern dramatic view. (The Song of Solomon an erotic drama with two or more principal personages, that is, either with a simpler or —by the assumption of several love affairs —a more complicated action).

J. C. JACOBI (Preacher at Celle), *Das durch eine leichte und ungekünstelte Erklärung von seinen Vorwürfen gerettete Hohelied* [The Song of Solomon freed from objections by a simple and inartificial explanation] 1771. The whole a song in praise of conjugal fidelity, if not strictly dramatic, yet preserving the dialogue form, worthy of a sacred poet, and instructive and salutary for the times of Solomon and his successors.—"Shulamith is by reason of her beauty brought to Solomon's court together with her husband, who has been moved by kindness to divorce her (?); and as they are taking her away from her husband's side and presenting her wine, the king approaches and offers to kiss her. Shulamith is alarmed and cries to her husband: "he is going to kiss me!" *etc.*—The entire attempt is very awkward and clumsy throughout.

J. W. FR. HEZEL, *Neue Uebersetzung und Erklärung des Hohenlieds* [New Translation and Explanation of the Song of Solomon], 1777.

CHR. FR. v. AMMON, *Salomo's verschmähte Liebe oder die belohnte Treue* [Solomon's love disdained, or fidelity rewarded] Leipz., 1795 (likewise important on account of the attempt to show that the poem is strictly one melodramatic whole).

K. FR. STAEUDLIN, *über das Hohelied* [on the Song of Solomon] *in Paulus' Memorabilien*, Part 2, p. 178 ff., like Jacobi only in a more delicate and skilful manner he makes Shulamith's country lover come likewise upon the stage, and assigns to him a considerable share in the action, especially from ch. 6 onward.

K. FR. UMBREIT, *Lied der Liebe, das älteste und schönste aus dem Morgenlande* [Song of love the oldest and most beautiful of the orient] Gött. 1820; 2d Edit. 1828, and *Erinnerung an das Hohelied* [Reminder of the Song of Solomon], 1839, aims at the utmost simplification of the plot, and likewise the ethical idealizing of its contents in imitation of HERDER's esthetic view; he moreover declares viii. 8–14 to be a spurious addition.

H. EWALD, *Das Hohelied Salomonis übersetzt mit Einl., Anmerkungen, etc.*, [The Song of Solomon translated with an Introduction, Remarks, *etc.*] Gött., 1826; comp. *die poet. Bücher des A.*

Digitized by Google

Ps., I. 1839; 2d edit., with the title: *Die Dichter des A. Bds., etc.* [The poets of the Old Test.], 1866 (see above, § 3, Rem. 1 and 2.)

Köster, *über das Hohelied* [On the Song of Solomon] in Pelt's *Theol. Mitarbeiten* for the year 1839, No. 2.

Bernhard Hirzel, *Das Lied der Lieder oder der Sieg der Treue, übersetzt und erklärt* [The Song of Songs, or the triumph of fidelity, translated and explained]; Zürich, 1840, substantially follows Ewald, whose view he seeks to correct in particular passages.

Fr. Böttcher, *Die ältesten Bühnendichtungen* [The oldest stage-poetry], Leipz., 1850; comp. *Exeget.-Krit. Aehrenlese z. A. T.* [Exegetical and critical gleanings in the Old Test.], 1849, p. 80 ff., and *Neue Exeget.-Krit. Aehrenlese* [New exeget. crit. gleanings], Part III., 1865, p. 76 ff. He explains the Song of Solomon as "a melodramatic text of a popular stage-play performed in the kingdom of Israel about B. C. 950, directed against the royal house of Solomon and the morals of his harem so menacing to family life, and the exhibition accompanied after the manner of Hindoo, Chinese and even ancient Italian dramas by acting and brief improvisations;" in order to give the whole as burlesque and clownish a character as possible, he makes the shepherd penetrate several times into the royal harem from i. 15 onward (i. 15 ff.; iv. 7 ff.; vii. 12 ff.), treat his comrades, v. 1, to the viands and liquors of the wedding feast, and finally, vii. 12 ff., go off with his beloved, without the king doing anything to prevent it, *etc.*—Comp. § 2, Remark 1.

G. M. Rocke, *Das Hohelied, Erstlingsdrama aus dem Morgenlande, oder Familiensünden und Liebesweihe. Ein Sittenspiegel für Brautstand und Ehe* [The Song of Solomon, a primitive drama from the orient, or family sins and love's devotion. A moral mirror for the betrothed and married], Halle, 1851. He explains a large part of the various scenes as dreams, some of which were directly represented (by apparitions of ghosts), and some narrated subsequently (so, *e. g.*, ii. 8–17; iii. 1–5; v. 2–vi. 3); he takes other sections as v. 8 ff.; vi. 11 ff. to be rhapsodies of Shulamith's romantic and enthusiastic fancy, *etc.*)

E. Meier, *Das Hohelied, etc.* [The Song of Solomon] Tübingen, 1854, returns to the simpler and more moderate view of Ewald.

F. Hitzig, *Das Hohelied erklärt* [The Song of Solomon explained] in the *Kurzgefasstes exeget. Handb. zum A. T.* [Condensed exegetical manual to the Old Test.], Part 16, Leipzig, 1855, brings in besides Shulamith and her country lover—comp. § 2, Rem. 1,—also Solomon's wife (*e. g.*, iii. 6–11; iv. 16 ff.), and one of his concubines (vii. 2–11) speaking and acting, thus making the plot as complicated as possible.

E. F. Friedrich, *Cantici Canticorum Salomonis poetica forma*, 1855, and "*Das sogen. Hohelied Salomonis oder vielmehr das pathetische Dramation 'Sulamith' parallelistisch aus dem Hebr. übersetzt*" [The so-called Song of Solomon, or rather the pathetic drama 'Shulamith' translated from the Hebrew in parallelisms]. Reprinted from the *Altpreussische Monatsschrift*, Königsberg, 1866. He seeks with the minutest care to dissect the artistic structure of the dramatic whole in its details, distinguishing four acts with ten scenes and one hundred and sixty chain-links (*catellas*), or clauses into which the verses are sub-divided; he mingles with it much that is trifling and incongruous without doing justice in any way to the theological character of the poem.

J. G. Vaihinger, *Der Prediger und das Hohelied rhythmisch übersetzt und erklärt* [Ecclesiastes and the Song of Solomon rhythmically translated and explained], Stutt., 1858, follows for the most part the view of Ewald, but with a critically independent attitude.

Fr. Ed. Weissbach, *Das Hohelied Salomo's übersetzt, erklärt und in seiner kunstreichen poet. Form dargestellt* [The Song of Solomon translated, explained and exhibited in its highly artistic and poetical form], Leipz., 1858; by an acute and thorough criticism of the other erotic and dramatic views he simplifies the action of the piece to the extent of making it refer simply to one loving relation between Solomon and Shulamith, but denies the reality of the transaction (comp. § 4, Rem. 2), and in connection with this refuses also to admit the existence of a more profound ethical idea, or a typical and Messianic significance of the poem).

Ernest Renan, *Le cantique des cantiques, traduit de l' Hebreu, avec une étude sur le plan, l' âge et le caractère du poëme*, Paris, 1860, 2d edit., 1861, approaches, most nearly to the views

Digitized by Google

of BÖTTCHER and HITZIG, only he fantastically remodels them after his own fashion, and thus brings out a romantic sentimental pastoral piece, in which even a ballet is introduced (vii. 2 ff.: "*une danseuse du Harem*"). Comp. § 2, Rem. 1.

§ 7. CONCLUSION.

a. The typical-Messianic view, or that based upon its position in the redemptive history.

The two principal modes of viewing the Song of Solomon thus far considered, the purely allegorical as well as the one-sided treatment of it as secular history, not only have the suspicious circumstance against them that the greatest vacillation prevails in shaping the views of their adherents in detail from the earliest periods to the present, and that no one of these views commends itself at first sight as a perfectly satisfactory solution of the enigma; but both of them introduce into the text of the Song strange and unproved assumptions which are in flat contradiction with its peculiar character both internally and externally. The allegorical explanation, however it may be modified in its details, makes the utterly inconceivable and improbable, nay, monstrous assumption, that by the "king Solomon" of the song is meant not the historical ruler so named, but a heavenly prototype of the same name, nay, in actual fact, no other than Jehovah Himself, and then further involves itself in inextricable difficulties in its explanation of particulars, *e. g.*, of the sixty queens and eighty concubines of this heavenly Solomon, as well as of his mother, his sedan and crown, *etc.* To which is to be added further the suspicious circumstance that in every other instance in which the figurative language of the Old Test. symbolizes the relation of Jehovah to Israel as a marriage or betrothal, it is the bride that is represented in the least favorable light, nay, that is mostly described as a harlot* (so particularly in Hosea, Jeremiah, Ezekiel; comp. above, § 4, p. 16), whilst in the Song of Solomon the precise opposite of this is the case [?]. The profane secular-history explanation not only sees itself driven to various artificial hypotheses and auxiliary hypotheses, especially to the introduction of one, two, three or more subordinate persons, whose entrance upon the scene there is nothing in the text to indicate, and which, as particularly the "shepherd" or "herdsman," are introduced as apparitions, suddenly and without any thing to prepare the way for their coming; it also leaves totally unexplained how this mere worldly love-song, in which Solomon is alleged to be represented in so extremely disadvantageous a light as the seducer of female innocence, could have found admission to the canon of Scripture, and this with a title, which prefixed to it with commendatory emphasis the very name of Solomon himself, the great royal singer and sage (comp. § 1 and 3)! Against the allegorical or directly Messianic view testimony is borne by the too earthly and even sinful colors, in which Solomon, the historical Solomon of the 1st book of Kings, is depicted as the hero of the piece. The one-sided secular history explanation with its directly anti-Solomonic and consequently also anti-Messianic tendencies is refuted by the fact that Solomon's perseverance in his adulterous designs and polygamous desires in the face of Shulamith's innocence, cannot be shown to be a matter belonging to the subject of the piece by a single decisive proof-passage, but that on the contrary it is evident to an unbiassed exegesis that he and no other is Shulamith's lover, and the real object of the dramatic representation is his being brought back from the dizzy heights of a harem's voluptuous morals, to the morally pure and inviolable standpoint of conjugal chastity, love and fidelity.

Since the typical reference of the loving relation depicted in the piece to Christ and His Church, enters into combination with this simple and worthy view in the most unconstrained manner and of its own accord as it were, as has been already briefly intimated § 4, and as the exposition of the Song will have to show more in detail, this may be designated the typical-Messianic, or—since every element of the redemptive history possesses of itself, and by an inner necessity, a typical virtue which points forwards and upwards—the redemptive-history view. Attempts to establish and carry it out were probably already made here and there in the ancient church, especially as New Testament passages, such as above all Christ's declaration respecting Himself as a greater than Solomon (Matt. xii. 42; comp. Matt. vi. 28; Rev. iii. 20), appear to favor it

* [This Scriptural usage manifestly lies against ZÖCKLER's own interpretation rather than the allegorical, as commonly held.—TR.]

Digitized by Google

rather than the allegorical or the direct Messianic interpretation. But the greatly preponderating inclination of the fathers, which soon attained exclusive sway, to plunge immediately and at once into the spiritual sense, must have stifled in its birth every attempt to assert at the same time a historical sense, and branded it with the same anathema as the profane-erotic interpretation of THEODORE of Mopsuestia. It was not until after the middle ages, therefore, that more numerous and important attempts were made to unite the historical with the more profound spiritual meaning by the intermediate link of the type, and attempts not barely of the half-way, external sort, like that of GROTIUS (see § 6), but such as were seriously meant and worthily maintained. Thus above all that of the noble Spanish mystic, LOUIS DE LEON († 1591), who had it is true to pay the penalty in the prisons of the inquisition of his departure from the broadly trodden path of the traditional allegorizing, as well as his choice of the Spanish language for the composition of his commentary; and further the like attempts of the reformed interpreters, MERCIER, LIGHTFOOT and LOWTH, as well as of the famous Catholic preacher and historian BOSSUET. VON HOFMANN still tries to maintain the assumption common to these former adherents of the typical view, that the bride of the Song of Solomon was a daughter of Pharaoh, king of Egypt, whilst DELITZSCH and NAEGELSBACH who in the main agrees with him, espouse the view, which is without doubt to be preferred by reason of vii. 1, that the bride was an Israelitish country girl from Shunem.

SPECIAL BIBLIOGRAPHY.

LUIS DE LEON (*Ludovicus Legionensis*), *Cantar de los Cantares*—a translation and explanation of the Song of Solomon in classical Spanish, written about 1569. (According to the extracts given by C. A. WILKENS, *Fray Luis de Leon*, p. 206 ff., and the remarks by which he characterizes it, this expositor every where gives most prominence to the historical sense which he grasps with sound esthetic feeling and artless simplicity. "Only in individual passages is the veil lifted and the love of Jehovah to His people, of Christ to the soul, of believers to the Lord, appears as in the highest sense the rightful bearer of all the attributes heaped upon human love. For pure human love is the noblest copy of the divine. They are alike in their mutual aspirations, alike in their beginning, nutriment, development, operation, end; as also earthly beauty is the shadow of the eternally beautiful. Thus, too, the reception of the book into the canon is explained. The divine Spirit has in condescension to human weakness veiled the spiritual beauties of good things yet unknown in figures of things which are real, lovely and well known. We should learn to joy over the distant from the joy which the near affords, and thus suffer ourselves to be drawn to Him, who loves us above all."—FRAY LUIS conceives the theme of the book to be simply "the bliss and pain of love" described in the form of a pastoral poem, in which king Solomon is represented as a shepherd, and his bride Shulamith, the daughter of the Egyptian king, as a shepherdess. Their love is depicted in the nicest and most perfect manner: in other amatory poems there is only found a shadow of the feeling and bliss of love, here love is described in primal perfection even to the most subtle features of its being.—As the inquisition at Valladolid took offence at this treatise on Canticles, partly on account of its contents, and partly because it was written in Spanish, it remained unprinted, and LEON published subsequently, after he had languished five years in prison, for his complete justification a Latin treatise "FR. L. LEGIONENSIS, *In Cantica Canticorum Salomonis explanatio*" (Salom., 1580), in which, besides the historical sense, he also stated the spiritual more fully, and this partly in the allegorical, partly the typical method. Comp. WILKENS, *Ibid.*, p. 317 ff.).

JO. MERCERUS (*le Mercier*), *Commentarius in Job, Proverbia, Ecclesiast. et Cant. Canticorum*, 1573.

JOHN LIGHTFOOT, *Harmonia, Chronica et Ordo Vet. Testamenti;* Opera, Traj. ad Rh. 1699. [A Chronicle of the Times and the Order of the Texts of the Old Testament; in his Works, London, 1684. He says I., p. 76. "After the building of the summer-house in the forest of Lebanon, Solomon pens the book of the Canticles, as appeareth by these passages in it, Cant. iv. 8; vii. 4. Upon his bringing up Pharaoh's daughter to the house that he had prepared for her, 1 Kings ix. 24, he seemeth to have made this Song. For though the best and the most proper aim of it was at higher matters than an earthly marriage, yet doth he make his marriage

Digitized by Google

with Pharaoh's daughter a type of that sublime and spiritual marriage betwixt Christ and His church. Pharaoh's daughter was a heathen and a stranger natively to the church of Israel; and withal she was a black-moor, as being an African, as Cant. i. 4, 5 alludeth to it; and so she was the kindlier type of what Solomon intended in all particulars.—Tr.]

Rob. Lowth, *De Sacra poesi Hebræorum prælectiones academicæ;* Oxon., 1753, 1763 (*præl.* 30 ff.) [In the scheme and divisions of the book he adopts the view of Bossuet to be stated presently. In regard to its spiritual meaning he contends that it is neither a "continuous metaphor," nor a "parable properly so called," but a "mystical allegory in which a higher sense is superinduced upon a historical verity." The bride he decides, though not without hesitation, to have been Solomon's favorite wife, the daughter of Pharaoh; his marriage with an Egyptian being an apt adumbration of the Prince of peace, who espouses to Himself a church composed of Gentiles and of aliens. Her name he expresses in the form Solomitis, as derived from Solomon, like Caia from Caius, and intended to be suggestive of the higher sense of the Song.—Tr.]

Jacques-Benigne Bossuet, *Libri Salomonis, Proverbia, Ecclesiastes, Cantic. Canticorum, Sapientia, Ecclesiasticus, cum notis, etc.* Paris, 1693. [He supposes the Song to be divided into seven parts, corresponding to the seven days of the marriage feast. It commences with the bride's being brought home to her husband's house on the evening which, according to Jewish reckoning, ushers in the first day. Then the successive mornings are indicated by the adjuration of the bridegroom as he leaves his chamber, ii. 7; iii. 5; viii. 4, or by the admiring language of the choir of virgins as the bride herself appears, iii. 6; viii. 5; vi. 10. The evenings are either expressly mentioned, iii. 1; v. 2, or may be inferred, ii. 6; viii. 3. The seventh day is shown to be the Sabbath by the fact of the bridegroom coming in public attended by his bride, viii. 5, instead of going forth alone to his occupation as he had done previously.—Tr.]

[A. Calmet, *Commentaire littéral sur le Cantique des Cantiques.* "His views are substantially the same as Bossuet's."]

(Harmer), *Materialien zu einer neuen Erklärung des Hohenliedes, Vom Verfasser der Beobachtungen über den Orient.* From the English, 2 Parts, 1778–79. [The original title is, The Outlines of a New Commentary on Solomon's Song, drawn by the help of Instructions from the East, containing—I. Remarks on its general nature; II. Observations on detached Places of it; III. Queries concerning the rest of this poem. By the author of Observations on divers Passages of Scripture. London, 1768.] He explains like those before named, the whole as a celebration of Solomon's marriage with a daughter of the king of Egypt, and leaves the profounder spiritual meaning almost entirely out of sight. [He finds two queens in the course of the Song—the former principal queen who speaks, iii. 1, *etc.*, and the daughter of Pharaoh who is henceforth made her "equal in honor and privileges," and who is "frequently mentioned afterwards in history, while the other is passed over in total silence," this new marriage being an apt representation of the "conduct of the Messiah towards the Gentile and Jewish churches."—Tr.]

Salvador, *Histoire des institutions de Moïse*, Vol. II. Paris, 1828 (like the preceding.)

J. Chr. K. v. Hoffmann, *Weissagung und Erfüllung* [Prophecy and Fulfilment] I., 189 ff.; *Schriftbeweis* [Scripture proof] II., 2, 370 ff. (comp. above § 2, Rem. 1, § 4, Rem. 1.)

Franz Delitzsch, *Das Hohelied untersucht und ausgelegt* [The Song of Solomon investigated and expounded], 1851 (see above, § 2 and 4.)

Ed. Naegelsbach, in Reuter's *Allg. Repertorium der theol. Literatur*, 1851, No. IV.

Schlottmann, see immediately below.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE EXPLANATION OF THE SONG OF SOLOMON IN MONOGRAPHS.

G. A. Ruperti, *Symbolæ ad interpretationem S. Codicis.* Vol. I., *fasc.* 1, 2, Götting., 1782.

P. Andr. van Kooten, *Observationes ad nonnulla Cantic. Canticorum loca; dissertat.*, Ultraj., 1774.

J. F. Neunhöfer, *Versuch eines neuen Beitrags zur Erklärung des Hohenlieds* [Essay toward a new contribution to the explanation of the Song of Solomon], Leipz., 1775.

Anton, *Salomonis carmen melicum ad metr. prisc. et mod. music. revocatum.* Viteb., 1793.

J. F. Gaab, Beitraege, *etc.* See above, p. 37.

Lindemann, in Keil's *und* Tzschirner's *Analekten*, III., 1, p. 1 ff.

Digitized by Google

HARTMANN, in WINER's *Zeitschrift*, I. 3, p. 420 ff.

G. HOELEMANN, *die Krone des Hohenlieds* (allegorical explanation of ch. viii), Leipz., 1856.—see above, p. 32.

SCHLOTTMANN, The bridal procession of the Song of Solomon (iii. 6–11) in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1867, II, ranges himself at the very beginning decidedly on the side of the typical expositors: "Whatever we may think of the origin and strict literal sense of the Song of Solomon, the right will ever verify itself anew, to see in the love there represented the emblem of the higher divine love which unites the church to her heavenly Lord," *etc.*)

SUPPLEMENTARY BIBLIOGRAPHY ADDED BY THE TRANSLATOR.

English Commentaries on the Song of Solomon.

[Venerable BEDE wrote seven books on the Canticles. The first is "a controversial preface warning his readers against the Commentary of JULIAN of Eclanum which that writer had made a vehicle for his Pelagian doctrines." This betrayed WILLIAMS (and GINSBURG, who copies him) into the error of supposing that the whole "work was intended as a defence of the doctrines of grace against the Pelagians." The seventh book "comprises a series of extracts from all parts of GREGORY's writings, bearing upon the Song." In the other five books "he has followed the footsteps of the fathers, leaving the works of GREGORY intact."

"The Commentary of FOLIOT, Bishop of London in the 12th century, with the Compendium of ALCUIN, was printed in 1638, and is repeatedly referred to by Dr. GILL."

SCOTUS is favorably spoken of by POOLE, *Synopsis Crit.*, Vol. II., Pref., as not one of the last to be named of this period; "*author non inter postremos memorandus.*"

The first three chapters of the Canticles, with BEZA's sermons on them, translated by JOHN HARMAR, Oxford, 1587.

THOMAS JAMES (librarian at Oxford), Expositio libri Canticorum, ex patribus. 4to, Oxford, 1607.

THOMAS WILCOCKS, An Exposition upon the book of the Canticles, London, 1624.

HENOCH CLAPHAM, The first Part of the Song of Songs expounded and applied, London, 1602.

BISHOP HALL, An open and plain Paraphrase upon the Song of Songs, London, 1609.

J. BEALE, Solomon's Song with an Exposition, London, 1615.

HENRY AINSWORTH (a Brownist divine), Annotations upon the five books of Moses, the book of the Psalms, and the Song of Songs or Canticles, London, 1639. This volume has done much to shape the current allegorical exposition of the Song. It is accompanied by a metrical paraphrase.

THOMAS BRIGHTMAN, Commentary on the Canticles, London, 1644. "He regards the book as prophetic, and divides it into two parts; the first, chap. i.—iv. 6, describes the condition of the legal church from the time of David to the death of Christ: and the second, chap. iv. 7—viii. 14, the state of the evangelical church from A. D. 34 to the second coming of Christ."

JOHN COTTON, A brief Exposition of the whole book of Canticles, London, 1648. He likewise regards it as descriptive of the state of the church from Solomon's own time to the last judgment.

JOHN ROBOTHAM, Exposition on the whole book of Solomon's Song, London, 1652.

ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES, Annotations upon all the books of the Old and New Testament, London, 1657. Very brief notes mainly occupied with suggesting the spiritual import of the Song.

W. GUILD, Love's Intercourse between the Lamb and his Bride, Christ and His Church, in a clear explication and application of the Song of Solomon, London, 1658.

JAMES DURHAM, Clavis Cantici, London, 1668. "Published after his death with a recommendation by Dr. OWEN."

DE VEIL, Explicatio Literalis Cant. Cant., London, 1679.

JOHN COLLINGES, The Intercourses of Divine Love betwixt Christ and His Church, or the particular believing soul, metaphorically expressed by Solomon in Canticles i. and ii., 2 vols., London, 1683.

Digitized by Google

JOHN TRAPP, A Commentary upon the book of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and the Song of Solomon, London, 1650.

BISHOP PATRICK'S Paraphrase and Annotations on this Song were published in 1700; MATTHEW HENRY'S Exposition a few years after.

WHISTON published an Essay in 1723, charging the Song of Solomon with containing "from the beginning to the end marks of folly, vanity and looseness," maintaining "that it was written by Solomon when he was wicked, and foolish, and lascivious, and idolatrous," and urging its rejection from the sacred canon.

JOHN GILL, An Exposition of the book of Solomon's Song commonly called Canticles, London, 1728. "A vast treasure of varied learning, sound doctrine and spiritual experience; but it is neither sufficiently condensed, nor is it so digested by the author as to present to the reader a clear idea of his own interpretation." He pushes the allegory to the furthest extreme, and attaches every sense to the words which they can possibly bear. The first edition contains a translation of the Targum upon this book. Another comment by the same author is contained in his Exposition of the Old and New Testament.

JOHN WESLEY, in his Explanatory notes upon the Old Testament, Bristol, 1765, also defends the allegorical interpretation of this book, and especially disallows its reference to Solomon and Pharaoh's daughter.

[GIFFORD], A Dissertation on the Song of Solomon, with the original text divided according to the metre [upon BISHOP HARE'S hypothesis], and a poetical version, 1751. He "considers the poem as a pastoral composed by Solomon as the amusement of his lighter hours, just after his nuptials with Pharaoh's daughter, and before God had so remarkably appeared to him and given him that divine wisdom, for which he was afterwards so eminent."

[BISHOP PERCY], The Song of Solomon, newly translated from the original Hebrew, with a commentary and annotations, London, 1764. He confines himself to the literal sense, and adopts substantially the view of BOSSUET that it was written on the occasion of Solomon's marriage with Pharaoh's daughter, and is divided into seven parts answering to the seven days of the wedding feast.

MRS. BOWDLER, Song of Solomon paraphrased, with an introduction, containing some remarks on a late new translation (PERCY'S) of this sacred poem; also a commentary and notes critical and practical, Edinburgh, 1775.

DURELL, Critical remarks on Job, Proverbs, Psalms, Ecclesiastes and Canticles, 1772, follows the same general theory, but "totally excludes any allegorical or spiritual design."

The Song of Solomon paraphrased, with an Introduction, Commentary and Notes (published anonymously), Edinburgh, 1775.

W. GREEN, The Poetical Parts of the Old Testament translated, with notes, 1781.

BERNARD HODGSON, Solomon's Song translated from the Hebrew, Oxford, 1786. "The mystical sense of the Song is never referred to—not denied, still less acknowledged."

T. WILLIAMS, The Song of Songs, which is by Solomon, a new translation with a commentary and notes, London, 1801. Republished in Philadelphia, 1803. Adopts like the preceding the general hypothesis of BOSSUET and LOWTH, and takes note of the spiritual meaning throughout.

JOHN MASON GOOD, Song of Songs, or sacred Idyls translated, with notes critical and explanatory, London, 1803. Containing a literal prose translation and a very elegant metrical version. "A work of great beauty, in which the author allows and defends the allegorical, but confines himself to the literal sense." He "regards the entire song as a collection of distinct idyls upon one common subject, and that the loves of the Hebrew monarch and his fair bride."

WILLIAM DAVIDSON, Brief outline of an examination of the Song of Solomon, with remarks critical and expository, London, 1817. He interprets "the Song of Solomon of the Christian church from the time of John the Baptist."

SCOTT'S Notes in his Commentary on the Bible follow the current allegorical exposition, and are largely drawn from BISHOP PATRICK.

ADAM CLARKE eschews the allegorical interpretation, and assigns as his reasons: "1. Because we do not know that it is an allegory. 2. If one, the principles on which such allegory is to be explained do nowhere appear." Appended to his commentary is a translation of the Targum or

Digitized by Google

Chaldee paraphrase of this book; also the Hindoo mystical poem, the *Gitagovinda*, which, agreeably to the suggestion of Sir William Jones, he regards as illustrative of the Song of Solomon.

B. Boothroyd, The Hebrew Scriptures of the Old Testament without points after the text of Kennicott, accompanied with English Notes, critical, philological and explanatory, 2 vols. 4to. The notes consist for the most part of extracts from preceding commentators, chiefly Percy, Green, Good, Hodgson, and Harmer.

John Fry, Canticles, a new translation with notes, London, 1811. The book is regarded as a collection of idyls, some of which were suggested by the marriage of Solomon, others by different domestic scenes in humble life; but all are parables of the love of Christ and His Church.

Charles Taylor in the Biblical Fragments (Nos. 345-453) appended to Calmet's Dictionary, 1838. Well characterized by Moody Stuart: "His translation and arrangement of the Song of Songs—relating merely to its outward structure as Solomon's marriage festival—evince great research, abundant ingenuity, the utmost delicacy and refinement of feeling, along with a most exuberant fancy."

W. Newman, Solomon's Song of Songs, a new translation, London, 1839.

Pye Smith in his "Scripture Testimony to the Messiah," 1847, "regards this Song as a pastoral eclogue or a succession of eclogues representing in the vivid color of Asiatic rural scenery the honorable loves of a newly married bride and bridegroom." This led to a controversy between him and Dr. Bennett in the Congregational Magazine for 1837 and 1838, respecting the proper interpretation of the Song. A subsequent article in the same periodical (for 1838, p. 471 ff.) declares that there is "no more reason for its spiritual interpretation than for its application to the revival of letters, the termination of feudalism, or any other gratifying circumstance in civil or political life." Ginsburg.

J. Skinner, An Essay towards a literal or true radical exposition of the Song of Songs.

Robert Sandeman, On Solomon's Song.

W. Romaine, Discourses upon Solomon's Song.

R. Hawker, Commentary on Solomon's Song.

Meditations on the Song of Solomon, London, 1848.

Francis Barham, The Song of Solomon.

Adelaide Newton, The Song of Solomon compared with other parts of Scripture, 1852.

Peter Macpherson, The Song of Songs shown to be constructed on architectural principles, Edinburgh, 1856. "His supposition that this song consists of verses written round an archway, is so entirely gratuitous, that it is only misguiding and deceptive." Moody Stuart.

Kitto in his Pictorial Bible and in his Daily Bible Illustrations "presents much useful information on the Song of Solomon."

Samuel Davidson, (The Text of the Old Testament Considered, London, 1856, and Introduction to the Old Testament, 1862) adopts the shepherd hypothesis, regards it as a purely amatory poem, having neither an allegorical nor a typical sense, and written not by Solomon, but by a citizen of the northern kingdom twenty-five or thirty years after Solomon's death.

A. Moody Stuart, An Exposition of the Song of Solomon, London, 1857 (republished Philadelphia, 1869). The peculiarity of this eminently devout and spiritual commentary is the parallel instituted and carried out in a most ingenious and elaborate manner between the Song of Solomon and the Gospels and Acts of which it is regarded as a prophetic epitome. He regards i. 2—ii. 7 as descriptive of the period immediately before and after the birth of Christ; ii. 8—iii. 5 from the appearance of John till the baptism of Jesus; iii. 6—v. 1 from Christ's return out of the wilderness till the last supper; v. 2—viii. 5 from the agony in the garden till the evangelizing of the Samaritans; viii. 5-14 from the calling of the Gentiles till the close of revelation.

Benjamin Weiss (a converted Jew), The Song of Songs unveiled, a new translation and exposition of the Song of Solomon, Edinburgh, 1859. He conceives it to be "half historical and half prophetical," and to embrace the entire interval from the dedication of the tabernacle of Moses to the resurrection of Christ and the formation of churches among the Gentiles.

Christian Ginsburg, The Song of Songs translated from the original Hebrew, with a commentary historical and critical, London, 1857, and in his article on Solomon's Song in the third Edition of Kitto's Cyclopedia, advocates the shepherd hypothesis. "This song records the his-

Digitized by Google

tory of an humble but virtuous woman, who after having been espoused to a man of like humble circumstances, had been tempted in a most alluring manner to abandon him, and to transfer her affections to one of the wisest and richest of men, but who successfully resisted all temptations, remained faithful to her espousals, and was ultimately rewarded for her virtue." The historical sketch of the exegesis of the book is very full and valuable, though warped by the peculiar views of the writer.

Joseph Francis Thrupp, The Song of Songs, a revised translation, with introduction and commentary, Cambridge, 1862, divides the Song into six groups; see note on p. 11. "The theme of the first group is the anticipation of Christ's coming; the second represents the waiting for that blessed time; in the third he is arrived, and we have there the description of the espousal and its fruits. The fourth group delineates the subsequent bodily departure of the Bridegroom from his Bride; the fifth his spiritual presence with her; and the sixth their complete and final reunion." "The earlier half of the Song presents to us only those glories which older seers had in various ways also heralded. With respect to the latter half of the Song the case is different. The distinctness with which it is there unfolded that the coming of the Messiah will not of itself be the final termination of all earthly expectation and anxiety is unparalleled not merely in all earlier Scripture, but throughout the whole of the Old Testament. Nowhere else do we find a passage which speaks as Cant. v. 2–8 speaks of a withdrawal of the Messiah from the church for whose salvation He has once appeared." This he accounts for by supposing it based on a typical application of the translation of Elijah. The untimely removal of this distinguished prophet, who was fondly styled "the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof," and the painful void created by his departure, foreshadowed a similar experience in the case of Messiah, the last and greatest of the prophets, who should in like manner forsake His sorrowing people for a season, though with the view of ultimately returning never to leave them more. The Song he supposes to have been written a century or more after the death of Solomon by a member of one of the prophetical schools in the kingdom of the ten tribes.

Isaac Taylor, The Spirit of the Hebrew Poetry; republished in New York, 1862, devotes chap. x. to Solomon and the Song of Songs.

Chr. Wordsworth, The Books of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and the Song of Solomon in the authorized version, with notes and introductions (Vol. IV. Part III. of his Commentary on the Bible), London, 1868. He regards it as a prophetic allegory, suggested by the occasion of Solomon's marriage with Pharaoh's daughter, and descriptive of "the gathering of the world into mystical union with Christ, the consecration of the world into a church espoused to Him as the Bride."

W. Houghton, Translation of the Song of Solomon, and short explanatory notes (London, 1865), in which, as stated by the American editor of Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, the Song is viewed as secular and the theme conceived to be the fidelity of chaste love.

American Commentaries.

Of the discussions of this book which have appeared in this country, the most noteworthy are the following:

Moses Stuart, in his Critical History and Defence of the Old Testament Canon (Andover, 1845), devotes pp. 364–385 to a consideration of the Canticles. He regards it as "expressing the warm and earnest desire of the soul after God in language borrowed from that which characterizes chaste affection between the sexes," and as applicable to the church only in so far as what pertains to individuals who are pious is common to the entire body of believers. He thinks the book to be so peculiarly Oriental in its imagery and style of thought, that while adapted to the religious wants of those amongst whom it originated, and probably reserved for a new period of usefulness in the East when Christianized, it is of inferior value to occidental Christians generally.

George R. Noyes, A new Translation of the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and the Canticles, with introductions and notes, chiefly explanatory, Boston, 1846. He conceives the book to be a collection of amatory songs "written by some Jewish poet, either in the reign of Solomon or soon after it," and without any "express moral or religious design."

Digitized by Google

CALVIN E. STOWE, in the *Biblical Repository* for April, 1847, gives a partial translation of the Song of Solomon, and defends its allegorical interpretation.

GEORGE BURROWES, A Commentary on the Song of Solomon, Philadelphia, 1853; also an article on the Song of Solomon in the Princeton Review for October, 1849. "The Song is a continuous and coherent whole, illustrating some of the most exalted and delightful exercises of the believing heart." He deems it "more profitable and natural in meditating on this book, to view the bride as the representative of the individual believer rather than of the whole church. As the church is a collection of individuals, its state must be that of the members composing it; and no distinction can be drawn between the love of Jesus for the collective body and His love for the several persons constituting the whole mass." The illustrations from Oriental manners and parallel passages in ancient and modern literature are particularly copious and judicious.

LEONARD WITHINGTON, Solomon's Song translated and explained, Boston, 1861. The bride of the Song is the daughter of an Arab Sheikh (vii. 1), whom Solomon married, as he did a multitude of other princesses from the little tribes around Palestine, with the "wish of spreading the Hebrew empire and religion through the vicinity. And he writes this poem to show how pure his felicity, how happy his marriage with a rural bride taken from a pagan nation, whom nevertheless he brings under the influence of the true religion, and hopes to convert to the true faith, and make one of the instruments of promoting the glory of his peaceful kingdom. But the occasional song was exalted by the providence of God into a higher purpose. That purpose was mainly and primarily to foreshow the formation and union of the Gentile church with Christ, when a more sublime and spiritual religion should be presented."

A. R. FAUSSET and B. M. SMITH, The Poetical Books of the Holy Scriptures with a critical and explanatory commentary, Philadelphia, 1867. Largely based upon the commentary of MOODY STUART, whose divisions and historical application it adopts.

Metrical Translations.

The metrical translations of the Song of Solomon are very numerous. In addition to the Latin paraphrases by A. JOHNSON, (Physician to Charles I.) and J. KER (Professor of Greek in Aberdeen, 1727) commended by MOODY STUART for their elegance, and an anonymous English paraphrase "The loves of the Lord with his troth-plight spouse" quoted and spoken of with approbation by the same author, it has been versified (either separately or combined with the Psalms or other poetical portions of the Old Testament), by WILLIAM BALDWIN, 1549; J. SMITH, 1575; ROBERT FLETCHER, 1586; DUDLEY FENNER, 1587; MARKHAM, 1596; ARGALL, 1621; AINSWORTH, 1623; SANDYS, 1641; BOYD, 1644; R. SMITH, 1653; HILDERSHAM, 1672; T. S. (London) 1676; WOODFORD, 1679; HILLS, 1681; LLOYD, 1682; MASON, 1683; REEVE, 1684; BEVERLEY, 1687; BARTON, 1688; FLEMING, 1691; STENNETT, 1700; SYMSON, 1701; RALPH ERSKINE, 1736; TANSUR, 1738; ELIZABETH ROWE, 1739; BLAND, 1750; JOHNSON, 1751; GIFFORD, 1751; BARCLAY, 1767; ANN FRANCIS, 1781; GOOD, 1803; MASON, 1818; TAYLOR, 1820; a late graduate of Oxford, 1845; Metrical Meditations, 1856. Another is announced as forthcoming by MR. WILLIAM S. RENTOUL, of Philadelphia, to accompany his edition of MOODY STUART's commentary.

For Sermons preached on different passages from the Song of Solomon, see DARLING's Cyclopædia Bibliographica: Holy Scriptures, pp. 583–586.—TR.]

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

THE

SONG OF SOLOMON.

TITLE:

I. 1 THE SONG OF SONGS, WHICH IS BY SOLOMON.

FIRST SONG.

The first time the lovers were together at the royal palace (in or near) Jerusalem.

(Chap. I. 2—II. 7).

FIRST SCENE:

Shulamith and the Daughters of Jerusalem.

(Chap. I. 2–8).

Shulamith.

2 [1]Let him kiss me with kisses[2] of his mouth,
[3]for better is thy love than wine!
3 In fragrance thine unguents are good;[4]
[5]an unguent[6] poured forth is thy name,[7]
therefore virgins love thee.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] [Wicliffe: The Church of the coming of Christ speaketh, saying. Matthews: The voice of the Church. Coverdale: O that thy mouth would give me a kiss, for thy breasts are more pleasant than wine, and that because of the good and pleasant savor.].

[2] On the combination of the kindred words נשק and נשיקה. Comp. 1 Kin. i. 12; ii. 16; Isa. i. 13; viii. 10; Jon. i. 10, 16, and generally Ewald, *Lehrbuch*, § 281 *a*, [Green's *Heb. Gram.* § 271, 3].

[3] [Wicliffe: The voice of the Father.]

[4] [Thrupp's proposed emendation לריח שמני קטורים "like as the scent which cometh from incenses," is nothing but ingenious trifling, and has not even the merit of being good Hebrew.—Tr.]

[5] [Wic. The voice of the Church.]

[6] Observe the assonance in שֶׁמֶן and שֵׁם which is probably intentional. [Thrupp: as ointment thou art, by thy name, poured forth.]

[7] In regard to the construction of the words שֶׁמֶן תּוּרַק שְׁמֶךָ four views are possible: 1. שֵׁם is taken as the subject, and תּוּרַק as 3 pers. fem. here employed because שֵׁם is exceptionally used as a feminine after the analogy of the Ethiopic (so Ew.: "thy name is poured out as an ointment;" Vaih.: "as the fragrance of balsam thy name pours itself forth," *etc.*) 2. שֶׁמֶן is regarded as the subject, which is here exceptionally treated as feminine, and to which תּוּרַק belongs as a relative clause; "an unguent, which is shed forth, is thy name" (so the Septuag., Vulg., Luth. and the generality of interpreters). 3. שֶׁמֶן is taken as a masc., but the form תּוּרַק is regarded as a hardened form for יוּרַק (after the analogy of Isa. xliv. 28; Eccles. x. 15), and accordingly translated as before (Hitzig). 4. תּוּרַק is held to be the 2 pers. sing. fut. Hophal with a double accusative: "thou art poured forth in respect to thy name as ointment," *i. e.*, thou, or more precisely thy name, diffusest a noble fragrance, like a box of ointment which is emptied of its contents (so J. H. Michaelis: "*sicut oleum effunderis nomine tuo;*" Hengstenb., Weissb.). This last construction is to be preferred as grammatically the best established, while it agrees in sense substantially with Nos. 2 and 3.

Digitized by Google

SHULAMITH AND THE DAUGHTERS OF JERUSALEM (in responsive song).

4 Draw me!—after thee will we run!—[1]
[2]The king has brought me into his chambers![3]
We will exult and be glad in thee,
will commend[4] thy love beyond wine!—
Rightly[5] do they love thee!

SHULAMITH.

5 [6]Black I am, but [7]comely, ye daughters of Jerusalem,
as the tents of Kedar, as the tent-cloths of Solomon.
6 Look[8] not at me, because[9] I am dusky,[10]
because the sun has scorched[11] me;
[12]my mother's sons were angry[13] with me,
made me keeper of the vineyards;—
mine own vineyard I have not kept.[14]

(*Looking around for Solomon*).

7 [15]Tell me, thou whom my soul loveth, where[16] feedest thou?
where makest thou (thy flock) to recline at noon?
For[17] why should I be as one straying[18]
by the flocks of thy companions?

DAUGHTERS OF JERUSALEM.

8 [19]If thou know not,[20] fairest among women,
go forth in the footprints of the flock
and feed thy kids beside the shepherds' tents.

1 [MATT. Yea, that same moveth me also to run after thee.]
2 [MATT. The spousess to her companions.]
3 [COV., CRANMER, BISHOPS: "privy chamber;" DOWAY: "cellars," altered in later editions to "store-rooms."]
4 Upon הִזְכִּיר prop. "to mention, bring to remembrance," then "to mention with praise, celebrate," comp. Ps. xx. 8; Isa. xlviii. 1; lxiii. 7; also Ps. xlv. 18; 1 Chron. xvi. 4, where it is parallel to הוֹדָה *thank, praise.*
5 [COV. Well is them that love thee. ENG. VER. The upright, Marg. uprightly. NOYES, BURROWES: sincerely.]
6 [WIC. The Church, of her tribulations. MAT. The voice of the Church in persecution. COV., CRAN. I am black, (O ye daughters of Jerusalem) like as the tents of the Cedarenes and as the hangings of Solomon; but yet I am fair and well-favored withal. GINSBURG: swarthy.]
7 [WITHINGTON: fair; BURROWES: lovely.]
8 [COV. marvel; DOWAY: consider; WILLIAMS, NOYES: gaze; WITH. scorn; GINSBURG: disdain.]
9 שֶׁ signifies in both instances, in שֶׁאֲנִי and in שֶׁשֱּׁזָפַתְנִי not "for," but "for the reason that," "because" (εἰς ἐκεῖνο ὅτι); comp. Ex. ii. 2. The second clause is therefore co-ordinated with the first, although explanatory of it (comp. WEISSB. in loc.)
10 [COV.: so black. E. VER. black; DOWAY: brown; WEISS: swarthy; BUR., THRUPP: dark.] On שְׁחַרְחֹרֶת blackish, dusky (not "very black, deep black," as HITZ. and formerly EWALD too would have it), comp. on ver. 5 above [GREEN'S *Heb. Gram.*, § 188].
11 שָׁזַף is not "look upon" [so E. V.; COV. shined; WILL. beamed; THRUPP: fiercely scanned; WEISS: glanced] (Septuag. παρέβλεψε, comp. Job xx. 9), but is here—שָׁדַף (Gen. xli. 23) "scorch, blacken," the sense already expressed by AQUILA (συνέκαυσέ με) and the Vulg. (*decoloravit me*) [GOOD: discolored; BUR., GINS. browned], and retained by most of the recent interpreters (in opposition to ROSENM., HENGSTENB., WEISSB.).
12 [MAT. The voice of the Synagogue.]
13 נִחֲרוּ either Niph. of חרר *to burn, glow,* (so EW., MEIER, HITZ.), or more probably from חרה (so that the sing. would be נִחֲרָה or נֶחֱרָה); for the Niph. of חרר always elsewhere means "to be dried, parched" (Ps. lxix. 4; cii. 4, *etc.*), whilst the meaning demanded here is "to be angry, wroth." Comp. GESENIUS' *Lexicon* and WEISSB. in loc. [COV.: had evil will.]
14 [COV.: Thus was I fain to keep a vineyard, which was not mine own.]
15 [WIC., MAT. The voice of the Church to Christ.]
16 אֵיכָה elsewhere *how?* [which WEISS. retains] is here—אֵיפֹה *where?* so too 2 Kin. vi. 13, K'thibh, whilst the Kri has אֵיכוֹ.
17 שַׁלָּמָה properly "for why" (comp. אֲשֶׁר לָמָּה, Dan. i. 10), a fuller expression for the simple לָמָּה *why*, as in Job xxxiv. 27, אֲשֶׁר עַל־כֵּן stands for עַל־כֵּן, Ps. xlv. 3. The sense is correctly given by the Sept. and Syr., which here and in Dan. i. 10 translate "that not, lest" (μήποτε). [COV.: and that. The critical conjecture mentioned by WILLIAMS, that this word should be pointed as a proper name שְׁלֹמֹה *O Solomon* is unworthy of attention.—TR.]
18 [WIC. go vagrant; COV. lest I go wrong and come unto the flocks of thy companions; E. VER. one (GENEV. she) that turneth aside; GOOD, PERCY, CLARKE: wanderer; WILLIAMS, FRY: stranger; TAYLOR: rover; GINSB.: roaming; E. VER. Marg. one that is veiled, so NOYES, WEISS., THRUPP.]
19 [WIC., MAT. The voice of Christ to the Church.]
20 לָךְ is here added inasmuch as the action returns upon its subject (comp. Prov. ix. 12; and ii. 6; viii. 14 below), so in general EWALD, *Lehrb.* § 315 *a* [GREEN'S *Heb. Chrest.* note on Isa. xl. 9.]

Digitized by Google

SECOND SCENE:

SOLOMON AND SHULAMITH.

(CHAP. I. 9—II. 7).

SOLOMON.

9 To my horse[1] in Pharaoh's chariots
I liken[2] thee, my dear.[3]
10 Comely are thy cheeks with chains,[4]
thy neck with beads.[5]
11 Chains[6] of gold will we make thee
with points[7] of silver.

SHULAMITH.

12 [8]Whilst the king is at his table,[9]
my spikenard yields its fragrance.
13 A bundle[10] of myrrh is my beloved[11] to me,
that lodges between my breasts.
14 A cluster of the cyprus-flower[12] is my beloved to me,
in the vineyards of Engedi.

SOLOMON.

15 [13]Lo! thou art fair, my dear,
lo! thou art fair; thine eyes are doves.

SHULAMITH.

16 [14]Lo! thou art fair, my beloved, yea sweet;
yea our couch is green.[15]
17 The beams[16] of our houses are cedars,
our wainscot[17] is cypresses.[18]
II. 1. [19]I am (only) a wildflower of Sharon,
a lily of the valleys.

SOLOMON.

2 As a lily among thorns,
so is my dear among the daughters.

1 [WIC. my riding; GENEV. troop (E. V. company) of horses; WILL.: the horse; NOYES: the horses; GINS.: my steed.]

2 [COV. There will I tarry for thee, my love, with mine host and with my chariots, which shall be no fewer than Pharaoh's.]

3 The plur. רַעְיוֹת [rather רַעְיֹת—TR.] Judg. xi. 37 K'thibh. [E. VER. my love, Marg. in ver. 15: companion; WILL.: consort; FRY: partner.]

4 [GENEV. rows *of stones;* E. VER. rows *of jewels;* FRY: jewels; WITH. chains; THRUPP, GINSB.: circlet; WEISS.: reins.]

5 [GENEV. chains; E. VER. chains *of gold;* DOWAY: jewels; FRY: strings of beads; GOOD, BURROWES: strings of pearls: THRUPP, WITH., GINSB. necklace; WEISS.: chains, *i. e.*, such as are attached to the pole or beam of the carriage, and which the horse wears on his neck.]

6 [In addition to the renderings given to this word in the preceding verse, WIC. here translates it: ribands; COV. neck-band; E. VER. borders; WITH. collars.]

7 [COV. buttons; E. VER. studs; WITH. stars.]

8 [WIC. The voice of the Church, of Christ. MAT. The voice of the Church.]

9 [So COV., ENG. VER.; GENEV. repast; DOWAY: repose, after the VULG. *accubitu* and the LXX ἀνακλίσει; GOOD: banquet; FRY: 'the king in his circuit' may either refer to his going round in some part of the procession, or to taking his stand in the midst of his retinue, or we may translate, 'until the king had taken his seat;' WILL., BURR. circle *of friends;* WEISS.: with his guest.]

10 [AINSW.: bag; TAYLOR: scent-bag; GOOD: casket; BURROWES: amulet.]

11 [COV. O my beloved. E. VER. my well-beloved, so constantly throughout the book in GENEV., except once in v. 9, "lover."]

12 [So COV., DOWAY, E. VER. Marg. The text of the Eng. Ver. has camphire.]

13 [WIC., MAT. The voice of Christ to the Church.]

14 [WIC., MAT. The voice of the Church to Christ.]

15 [COV., CRAN., BISH. Our bed is decked with flowers. DOW.: our little bed is flourishing.]

16 [COV. ceilings.]

17 [COV. balks; CRAN., BISH. cross-joints; E. V.: rafters, Marg.: galleries; GOOD, NOYES, FRY: roof; THRUPP: boardings; PARKHURST: ceiling; GESEN.: carved ceiling; FUERST: carved beams].

18 [E. VER. fir; AINS. brutin-tree.]

19 [WIC. The voice of Christ, of Him and of the Church; MAT. The voice of Christ.]

Digitized by Google

SHULAMITH.

3 [1]As an apple-tree among the trees of the wood,
so is my beloved among the sons.
In his shade delighted I sit.
and his fruit is sweet to my palate.[2]
4 He has brought me into the wine-house,
and his banner over me is love.
5 Stay me with pressed grapes,[3]
refresh[4] me with apples,
for I am sick of love.
6 His left hand is under my head,
and his right embraces me.
7 [5]I adjure you, ye daughters of Jerusalem,
by the gazelles or by the hinds of the field,[6]
that ye wake not, and that ye waken not
love till it[7] please.

1 [WIC., MAT. The voice of the Church, of Christ.]
2 [COV., CRAN., BISH., DOW. throat; GENEV. mouth; E. V. taste].
3 [COV. grapes; CRAN., BISH. cups; GENEV., E. V. flagons].
4 [E. V. comfort; Marg. straw me; DOWAY, compass me about; AINSWORTH: strew me *a bed;* WILLIAMS: strew citrons around me; THRUPP: strew me with citron leaves].
5 [WIC., MAT. The voice of Christ, of the Church; WIC., DOW. I adjure you; COV., CRAN., GENEV., E. V.: I charge you.]
6 [THRUPP has: "fells," so as to rhyme with "gazelles," in fancied imitation of the original].
7 [COV., DOW., GENEV. she; E. V. correctly: he; GINSB., THRUPP: it].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. For the explanation of the title, see the Introduction, § 1 and § 3. To the view of those who assign vers. 2–4 entirely to the "daughters of Jerusalem," and suppose the words of Shulamith to begin with ver. 5 (HITZ., VAIH. and others, so too DEL.) stands opposed—1. That the wish "to be kissed with the kisses of his mouth" could scarcely have been expressed by the ladies of the court, or even by one of them, without filling Shulamith with indignation, of which, however, she shows nothing in what follows. 2. That the way in which the lover is extolled in vers. 2, 3, agrees perfectly with the fond encomiums and enthusiastic descriptions which Shulamith subsequently, i. 13, ff., and ii. 3, ff., bestows upon her lover. 3. That the interchange of the 1st sing. and the 1st plur. plainly points to a diversity of persons speaking, or to an alternation between a single speaker and a whole chorus. This latter circumstance likewise renders their assumption impossible, who (as EW., HENGSTENB., WEISSB. and most of the older interpreters) suppose that the whole of vers. 2–7 is spoken by Shulamith. Undoubtedly Shulamith and the ladies of the court here respond to each other in speech or song; yet not so that only the words "Draw me after thee . . . chambers" ver. 4 *a* belong to Shulamith, and all the rest to ver. 5 to the "women of the harem" (so RENAN), but simply that all that is in the singular is to be regarded as spoken by her alone, and all that is in the plural by her and the ladies together, so that in particular נרוצה (we will run) and נגילה וגו (we will be glad, *etc.*) are to be assigned to the ladies who confirm the words of Shulamith by joining in them themselves, while משכני אחריך (draw me after thee), הביאני המלך חדריו (the king has brought me into his chambers) and מישרים אהבוך (they rightly love thee) belong to Shulamith alone* (comp. DÖPKE *in loc.*) Then vers. 5–7 unquestionably belong to Shulamith alone; ver. 8 again to the ladies of the court, who reply with good-humored banter to the rustic simplicity and *naiveté* with which she has expressed ver. 7 her desire for her royal lover; vers. 9, ff. to Solomon, who now begins a loving conversation with his beloved, reaching to the close of the act.† During this familiar and cosy chat, which forms the second scene of the act, the chorus of ladies withdraws to the back-ground, but without leaving the stage entirely; for the concluding words of Shulamith ii. 7 are manifestly directed to them again, and that not as absent, but as present on the stage. The place of the action must be supposed to be some locality in the royal palace or residence in or near Jerusalem, some one of the "king's chambers" (חדרי המלך) ver. 4; whether precisely the "room devoted to wine parties," the "wine-room of the royal palace" (DEL.), cannot, as it seems, be certainly determined from the repeated reference to the excellence of wine (i. 2, 4), nor from the mention of the "house of wine" (בית היין ii. 4);

* [So PATRICK, GOOD, WILLIAMS, TAYLOR, FRY, the last two of whom divide ver. 5 in like manner, assigning the words "but comely," and "as the curtains of Solomon" to the daughters of Jerusalem, who compliment the bride on her beauty, while she in the remaining clauses speaks depreciatingly of herself; TAYLOR also apportions vers. 2, 3 between the bride and her attendant ladies, to whom FRY adds an imaginary messenger from the king. HARMER carries the sub-division of parts to an equal extent, claiming that not only the variation in number, but the change of person from third to second, and *vice versa*, indicates a diversity of speakers. The majority of English Commentators regard the bride as the sole speaker in ver. 2, as is done also in the headings to this chapter in the authorized version, and either find in the change of number evidence of the plurality involved in the unity of the speaker, (POOLE, THRUPP), or suppose that she in thought associates her companions with herself, we, *i. e.*, "I and the virgins forementioned" (AINSWORTH), or that it is the language of modesty, though she means only herself (CLARKE)].

† [PATRICK, SCOTT and TAYLOR suppose it interrupted by the attendant ladies in ver. 11].

Digitized by Google

and even the "table" of the king spoken of i. 12 does not afford a perfectly sure support to this opinion. Only it appears to be certain from i. 16, 17 that we must imagine the scene to be open outwards, and to afford a prospect of fresh verdure and stately trees, such as cedars, cypresses, *etc.* It must therefore have been either a room in the king's palace upon Zion immediately adjacent to parks or gardens, or what in view of vi. 2, 3 (comp. iv. 16) is still more probable, an open summer-house (or pavilion) in the royal pleasure gardens of Wady Urtas, south of Jerusalem, near Bethlehem and Etam, in those magnificent grounds of David's splendor-loving son, which probably bordered upon Zion itself, and thence extended southward for several leagues, and of which there still remains at least a grand aqueduct, with three basins lying successively one above another, the so-called "pools of Solomon" (comp. K. FURRER, *Wanderungen durch Palästina*, Zürich, 1865, p. 178, *etc.*; C. HERUT, *Palästina*, p. 278, *etc.*; EWALD, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, III. 1, p. 64, *etc.*). That Shulamith had formed a personal acquaintance with the royal gardens in the neighborhood of Jerusalem directly after she had been brought from her home in the north of Israel to Solomon's court, is shown by her mention i. 14 of the "vineyards" or "vine-gardens of Engedi," near the Dead Sea, five or six German miles south-east of Jerusalem, from which however the conclusion must not be drawn that these pleasure-grounds of Engedi formed the scene of the action in the opening of the piece; see on that verse. WEISSBACH very properly locates the second scene of the Song from i. 9 onward in the gardens of Solomon near Jerusalem, but puts the action of vers. 1–8 somewhere on the way to this retreat, where Shulamith in her search for her lover chances to meet the women of Jerusalem. But in opposition to this may be urged—1. That there is nothing in the context to indicate a change in the locality between vers. 8 and 9. 2. The mention of the "king's chambers" in ver. 4 certainly implies the immediate vicinity of a royal palace, and probably the presence of the speaker in it. 3. It by no means follows from the metaphors borrowed from pastoral life, in which Shulamith speaks of her lover, ver. 7, that she thought he was really to be found in a "pasture ground," and engaged in feeding sheep. 4. With as little propriety can it be inferred from ver. 8 that Shulamith is represented as wandering about over the country and "accompanied by some little kids, searching for her lover in or near Jerusalem." *

2. FIRST SCENE. SHULAMITH. Vers. 2, 3.—**Let him kiss me with the kisses of his mouth.**—יִשָּׁקֵנִי—for which HITZIG needlessly reads יַשְׁקֵנִי, "let him give me to drink," *etc.* (comp. viii. 2)—is manifestly the utterance of a wish, "O that he would kiss me;" and its subject is not פִּיהוּ, "his mouth," which is too remote and manifestly stands in a genitive relation to נְשִׁיקוֹת "kisses;" nor מִנְּשִׁיקוֹת, equivalent to "one of his kisses" (EWALD, E. MEIER), for "a kiss kisses not but is kissed, and מִנְּשִׁיקוֹת includes an accusative" (HITZIG). The speaker's lover is rather thought of as the kissing subject, the same, whom in the vividness of her conception she immediately afterwards in *b* and in ver. 3 addresses in the second person, as though he who is so ardently longed for were already present.* The partitive מִן properly points to but one or a few kisses of her lover as the object of the beloved's wish; comp. Gen. xxviii. 11; Ex. xvi. 27; Ps. cxxxii. 11, and generally Ew., *Lehr.*, § 217, *b*, 294, *c*. [GREEN'S *Heb. Gram.*, § 242, *a*]; J. H. MICHAELIS, *in loc.*, "*uno tantum vel altero de osculis.*"—"Kisses of his mouth"† are, moreover, in contrast with the idolatrous custom of hand-kisses, or kissing the hand to any one (Job xxxi. 27; comp. DEL., *in loc.*), tokens of honest love and affection between blood relations and friends (Gen. xxix. 11; xxxiii. 4; xli. 40; 1 Sam. x. 1; xx. 41; comp. Ps. ii. 12), and especially between lovers (Prov. vii. 13). It is not likely that the similarity of the words נשק *kiss* and שקה *drink* gave occasion to the comparison in *b* of caresses with wine (WEISSB.); this comparison is of itself a very natural one; comp. iv. 10; v. 1; viii. 2.—**For better is thy love than wine.**—דֹּדִים different from דַּדִּים "breasts, paps" (which the LXX here express by μαστοί, and the Vulg. by *ubera* [so WIC., COV., DOW.]), as well as from דּוֹדִים plur. of דּוֹד "beloved" (v. 1), denotes manifestations of love, caresses, φιλοφροσύναι (comp. iv. 10, 11; vii. 13; Prov. vii. 18; Ezek. xvi. 8; xxiii. 17), *i. e.*, dalliance, exhibition of אַהֲבָה (vii. 7; viii. 6), fond endearments, (in bad taste VAIH., "*Liebelei*," flirtation.) In the comparison of such love with wine, the *tertium comparationis* is, as is shown by the parallels iv. 10, ff.; v. 1; vii. 9, ff. not the intoxicating power of wine, but primarily its sweetness ‡ only; comp. Acts ii. 13. The figure of intoxication indicates a higher grade of loving ecstasy than is here intended, comp. v. 1 *b*; Prov. v. 19; vii. 18, and in general WEISSB., *in loc.*

Ver. 3. **In fragrance thine unguents are good.**—לְרֵיחַ, "in respect to odor, as to fragrance," limits טוֹבִים, "good" (comp. Josh. xxii. 10; 1 Kings x. 23; Job xxxii. 4), and is emphatically placed at the beginning of the sentence. Commonly: "to the smell," or "for the smell," against which, however, lies the twofold objection: 1, that רֵיחַ denotes not the organ of smell, nor the act of smelling, but the odor which any

* [TAYLOR and WILLIAMS make the place to have been the bride's parlor in Solomon's palace, and the time the first day of the week preceding the marriage, i. 1–8 belonging to the morning, and i. 9—ii. 7 to the evening of the day. BURROWES follows HARMER in the conjecture that "in the opening scene of this poem the king had probably gone forth, according to Oriental customs, to meet the bride, and was awaiting her with his princely retinue in an encampment where his rich pavilion, ver. 5, stood pre-eminent. The spouse on coming in sight of those kingly tents, gives utterance to the strong emotions of her heart]."

* [PATRICK. As in John xx. 15 "the pronoun is used without a consciousness of the absence of the antecedent. Her heart is so full that she supposes every one must know who she means by *him*]."

† ["Permission to kiss the hand of a sovereign is considered an honor; but for that sovereign to give another the kisses of his mouth, is evidence of the tenderest affection, and is the highest possible honor."—BURROWES.]

‡ ["Thy love is more reviving and exhilarating than the effects of wine. Comp. Ps. civ. 15; Prov. xxxi. 6."—BURROWES].

Digitized by Google

thing exhales (*odor, halitus*), comp. i. 12; ii. 13; iv. 10; vii. 14; Hos. xiv. 7, *etc.*; 2, it is not לְרֵיחַ, but simply לְרֵיחַ. HITZIG's construction is quite too artificial; he connects 3 *a* with 2 *b* as its sublimitation, and translates "thy caresses are more precious than wine with the odor of thy precious ointment" (comp. the like mode of connection adopted in the Vulg., "*ubera—fragantia unguentis optimis*" [so COVERDALE, DOWAY]). So also is that of WEISSBACH, "thy ointments are good to serve as a perfume," where too much is evidently foisted into the simple לְרֵיחַ.*—**An unguent which is poured forth is thy name.**—The comparison of a good name with a fragrant unguent is also found, and on the basis of this passage in Hos. xiv. 7, 8; Eccles. vii. 1; Ecclus. xlix. 1. The ideas of smelling and being (or being named, bearing this or that name) are, as a general fact, closely related through the intermediate notion of breathing, respiring; comp. in German "*Gerücht, ruchbar.*"† That the name of the lover is thus compared to a costly perfume diffusing a wide fragrance (comp. Mark xiv. 3; John xii. 3) plainly indicates that it is only the renowned King Solomon, an actual possessor of שֵׁם (name, *i. e.*, fame, *gloria*—comp. Prov. xxii. 1; 1 Kings i. 47; Job xxx. 8), who can be thought of as this lover, and not a simple country swain (so WEISSB. properly against HERD., UMBR., *etc.*).—**Therefore virgins love thee**—*i. e.*, not barely on account of this thy renown, but on account of all the excellencies celebrated in ver. 2, 3. Observe that עֲלָמוֹת is without the article. It is not *the* virgins universally, but simply virgins, such as Shulamith herself, or the "daughters of Jerusalem," the ladies of Solomon's court, by whom she sees herself surrounded, that she describes as lovers, as reverential admirers of the graceful, brilliant and lovely king. The guileless country lass, who has but recently been transferred into the circle of the countless virgins of the royal court (comp. vi. 8) here accounts to herself for the fact that many other virgins besides her are attached to the king with admiring devotion and love; comp., 4. *c.*

3. SHULAMITH AND THE DAUGHTERS OF JERUSALEM.

Ver. 4. **Draw me after thee**—as it is to be translated with the TARG., LUTH. and most of the recent expositors, connecting contrary to the common accentuation אַחֲרֶיךָ with מָשְׁכֵנִי, which requires it as its proper complement;‡ comp. Hos. xi. 4; Jer. xxxi. 3. By this drawing is meant, as appears from *b*, a drawing into the king's chambers, or at least into immediate proximity to him, not a conducting out of the palace into the country, as the advocates of the swain-hypothesis suppose, who see in these words an ardent call upon her distant lover.—**We will run**—*i. e.*, not, "let us take flight, and hasten hence" [so GINSBURG: "Oh, let us flee together!"], as though here again there were a cry for help to her absent lover; but: "we will hasten to him," *viz.:* the gracious king; a lively exclamation uttered by Shulamith, and at the same time by the chorus of the daughters of Jerusalem catching the word from her.—**The king has brought me into his chambers**—a simple expression of the virgin's rapturous joy at the high honor and delight granted her by the king. As the words stand, they contain neither an indirect petition or complaint addressed to her distant lover (to which the following clauses of the verse would agree poorly enough), nor a wish directed to the king—as though the preterite הֱבִיאַנִי were to be taken in the sense of a precative or optative: "O that the king had brought me into his chambers" (so, *e. g.*, HUG, WEISSB.), nor finally a condition dependent on the following נָגִילָה וגו (so HAHN, who supplies אִם, *if*, before הֱבִיאַנִי. "If the king brings me into his chambers, we will,"* *etc.* Furthermore, the "king's chambers" are by no means simply identical with the harem, the house of the women belonging to the royal palace (VAIH., REN., *etc.*); this would rather have been designated בֵּית הַנָּשִׁים, as in Esth. ii. 3, 9, ff., or simply called בַּיִת, *house*, as in 1 Kings vii. 8; ix. 24; Ps. lxviii. 18, *etc.* They are 2 Sam. iv. 7; xiii. 10, the king's own rooms in the palace, his sleeping apartments and sitting-rooms, *penetralia regis*, in distinction from those of his wives and the ladies of the court, which formed a particular division of the royal palace. Comp. 1 Kings vii. 8; Esth. ii. 12–14. Into these the king's own innermost apartments, Shulamith, as the favored object of his special love, had been repeatedly brought,—nay, she has in them her own proper abode and residence. She had therefore a perfect right to say: "The king has brought me into his chambers."†—**We will exult and be glad in thee.**—With these words, which recall Ps. xxxi. 7; cxviii. 24; Isa. xxv. 9; Joel ii. 21, 23, the ladies of the court again chime in with the language of Shulamith, in order to commend with her the happiness of belonging to the number of those who were loved by the king. בָּךְ, *in thee*,

---

*[WEISS.: Besides or in addition to the savor, *etc.* A sense which the prep. rarely has, and which is neither admissible here nor in Ex. xiv. 28; Lev. xi. 26; xvi. 16, to which he appeals. Incorrectly also the Eng. Ver.: Because of the savor, *etc.*, which must then be connected with "therefore," *etc.*, in the last clause, the second clause being parenthetic. "She has ointments preparatory to her exaltation; just as Esther was purified to go in to the king, Esth. ii. 12."—WITHINGTON].

†[Comp. Eng. 'To be in good or bad odor' for good or ill repute. This explanation of the relation of these ideas, which is developed at length by BAEHR, *Symbolik d. Mos. Cultus*, I., p. 459 ff., appears to be too subtle and remote. It is simpler to find the connection in the fact that the odor, like the name, indicates the character or quality of that from which it proceeds, or to which it belongs. It is an efflux from the object itself, the impression which it makes *ad extra.*—TR.]

‡[There seems to be no sufficient reason for departing from the authority of the accents in the present instance. "We will run" requires "after thee" as its complement to indicate the direction of the running more than "draw me," where the direction is sufficiently implied. The violation of the accents is merely for the sake of evading the evidence afforded by the masc. pron. אַחֲרֶיךָ, that "after thee we will run" is still the language of the bride to Solomon—not of her virgin companions to the bride.—TR].

*[So too WEISS.: "When the king shall have brought me;" nor is it a prophetic preterite, the bride anticipating the time when she shall be brought (THRUPP). GINSBURG insists that the changes of person in this verse "clearly show that the king here referred to is a separate person from the beloved to whom the maiden is addressing herself." But he is compelled to acknowledge that just before in ver. 2 the third person and the second both refer to the same subject.—TR.]

†[This would seem to compel the conclusion that the marriage has already taken place, and is not still future, as our author supposes.—TR.]

Digitized by Google

belongs in equal measure to both verbs; comp. Isa. lxv. 19.—**We will celebrate thy love more than wine.**—Comp. ver. 2.—**Rightly do they love thee.**—The most obvious construction is to make the virgins again the subject, as in 3 *c*, and consequently to regard Shulamith as again the speaker. But the 3d plur. might also be taken impersonally (they, *i. e.*, people generally love thee. Comp. יָבֻזוּ, *they despise*, viii. 1), and then the clause might be spoken by the entire chorus. מֵישָׁרִים, an adverbial accusative (as, *e. g.*, פְּלָאִים, *wonderfully*, Lam. i. 9), means neither "without reserve" (Weissb.), nor "sincerely" (Gesen., Del.) [so Noyes; Eng. Ver. marg.: uprightly], but, as appears from the context and the parallels Ps. lviii. 2; lxxv. 3, "with good reason, rightly" (Ew., Hitzig, Vaih., *etc.*). This word is taken as the subject by the Sept. (εὐθύτης), Vulg. (*recti diligunt te*), Hengstenb. (rectitudes, *i. e.*, abst. for concrete, the upright love thee), Umbr. (O favorite of all the virtues), *etc.* [so Eng. Ver., Thrupp, Wordsworth, Withington, Ginsburg], interpretations as ungrammatical as they are unsuited to the connection. The attempts at emendation proposed by Velth., Schelling, Augusti, are altogether unnecessary* (see Weissb., *in loc.*).

4. Shulamith. Vers. 5–7.

Ver. 5. **Black I am, but comely.**—The explanation of the fact that she was black (שְׁחוֹרָה) contained in the following verse shows that by this blackness can only be meant her being browned by the hot sun. Then too in Lam. iv. 8 the substantive שְׁחוֹר denotes only the livid or swarthy appearance of one who has suffered long from famine and wretchedness, and in this very passage the strong expression "black" is qualified by the diminutive "blackish" (שְׁחַרְחֹרֶת) in the verse immediately following.—Moreover, the whole statement before us was occasioned according to ver. 6, by the curious looks with which Shulamith had meanwhile been regarded by many of the daughters of Jerusalem and probably also by jeering remarks which they had made (comp. ver. 8). "But comely" [Taylor: attractive, engaging] (נָאוָה., lit., "agreeable"); the plain country maid hereby expresses with frank, straightforward simplicity her consciousness that nevertheless she was not altogether unworthy of the love of Solomon. There is no vain self-laudation in the words.—**As the tents of Kedar, as the curtains of Solomon.**—The first of these comparisons is designed to illustrate and set before the mind the idea of blackness, the second that of comeliness or elegance. "Kedar is a Bedawîn tribe near Palestine in the Arabian desert, Gen. xxv. 13; Isa. xxi. 17, which is here named in preference to all others, simply because the name קֵדָר seems originally to denote "blackness." Tents of poor Bedawîns, which are always exposed to the heat of the sun, must certainly appear blacker and less attractive than those of Solomon; and we need not therefore with other interpreters (see especially Hitz. and Weissb. who refer to the observations of modern travellers as della Valle, Burckhardt, Harmer, Volney, *etc.*,) have recourse to the tents now commonly covered with black goat skins, as Shulamith only has in mind the blackness caused by the sun's rays. But Solomon's tents as a figure of the greatest elegance can only correspond to נָאוָה *comely*. We may without difficulty assume that the splendor-loving Solomon adopted the custom of oriental monarchs of living in tents once in the year in some charming district and in the utmost elegance and splendor (comp. the remarks above, ver. 1, respecting the pleasure grounds at Etham and Engedi.) It is, therefore, wholly unnecessary to understand by יְרִיעוֹת (with Del., Hitz., *etc.*,) tapestry,* which is neither permitted by usage nor by etymology, from יָרַע *continuit, prop. velum*, then tent-cloth." We shall have in the main to abide by this explanation of the passage given by Ewald, although we might assign to יְרִיעָה a different etymology, and derive it perhaps with Gesenius from יָרַע *to tremble, flutter*, or with Weissb. from יָרַע *to be bad, i. e.*, of coarse, inferior workmanship. The two comparisons are in any case understood in quite too artificial a manner by the latter and by several others, who assume that both the tents of Kedar and the tent-coverings of Solomon set forth the peculiar combination of dark color with attractiveness in Shulamith's looks (for which an appeal is made to the testimony of travellers like D'Arvieux, Shaw, *etc.*, according to whom a plain filled with the black tents of the Bedawîn presents a very pleasing and even beautiful spectacle.) In opposition to Böttcher's view, who though he assigns the words "Black am I, daughters of Jerusalem, as the tents of Kedar" to the "vinedresser," *i. e.*, to Shulamith, refers the rest ("but comely" and "as the tent cloths of Solomon") to an "elderly princess," who looks with astonishment at the new comer, comp. Hitz. *in loc.*, who properly rebukes the extravagance of the dissecting mania here exhibited.

Ver. 6. **Look not at me because I am dusky, because the sun has scorched me.** There is nothing in the context to indicate that the "look" is one of approval, in admiration of her beauty† (*versus* Böttcher, Hitz., *etc.*) Comp. above on ver. 5. **My mother's sons were angry with me.** Velth., Umbr., Ewald needlessly think of step-brothers or half-brothers; the passages adduced for this purpose Lev. xviii. 9; xx. 11: Deut. xxiii. 2, *etc.*, are outweighed by many others as Gen. xxvii. 29; Ps. l. 20; lxix. 9; Deut. xiii. 7, where "mother's sons" corresponds in the parallelism to "brothers," and consequently is entirely synonymous with it. And this expression is the less surprising in Shulamith's mouth since like a true Hebrew daughter she is in the habit of denominating everything after her mother; comp. "my mother's house," iii. 4; viii. 2, and so too Ruth i. 8. We need not even assume that she would intimate a less favorable judgment of her brothers

* [Fry, who disregards the points; they do right in loving thee. Good alters the text into: thou art every way lovely.]

* [Eng. Ver., curtains, Ainsworth: the goodly hangings that were in his house and about his bed.]

† [Look not disdainfully upon me, Hall; do not too accurately scrutinize, Taylor; Gaze with wonder at her presumption, Noyes.]

Digitized by Google

as more or less strange or distant in their bearing to her (ROCKE, HITZ.); and there is still less to justify the assumption that her brothers are by this expression emphatically designated as Shulamith's own brothers-german (*vs.* MAGNUS.) Yet it may with considerable probability be inferred from the expression before us, that Shulamith's father was no longer living at the time of this transaction, and her brothers had assumed the prerogatives of a father (comp. Gen. xxxiv. 5, ff.; 2 Sam. xiii. 20 ff.), but that her mother meanwhile was still living, which also seems to be favored by vi. 9, (viii. 2; iii. 4).—**Made me keeper of the vineyards.** This manifestly does not assign the reason of her brothers' anger, nor is this intimated in the following clause (vs. HENGSTENBERG and E. MEIER), it is rather passed over in silence as irrelevant. But this clause tells what her brothers did in consequence of their anger, and then the last clause states what further happened to her when degraded into a vineyard-keeper.—**Mine own vineyard I have not kept.**—The addition of שֶׁלִּי not only gives a special emphasis to the suffix in כַּרְמִי, but distinguishes the vineyard of Shulamith here named as quite distinct and of another sort from those of her brothers, which she had been obliged to keep (so viii. 12). It is a vineyard of a higher and more valuable kind, which alas! she had not carefully guarded. She herself with all that she has and is, must be intended by this vineyard of her own (comp. DEL. and WEISSB. *in loc.*), or it may be her beauty (Ew., DÖPKE., MAGN., HEILIGST., HITZ., VAIH.),—at all events every thing that she had to surrender to Solomon and devote to him when she became his beloved and followed him. There is, in these words, no serious lament for her lost virtue (on the contrary see iv. 12-16) or for her forsaken lover (as BÖTTCHER, MEIER and tentatively also VAIH.); but they contain a lament half in jest or with mingled sadness and irony for her forfeited freedom, for which she constantly longs in spite of her attachment to her royal lover. In favor of this double meaning of "vineyard" may also be urged the etymology of כֶּרֶם, which agreeably to its derivation from the root כרם, signifies the "noblest," the "most valued possession," the "highest good," (comp. Hos. ii. 17; Isa. v. 7; Ps. xvi. 6, as well as EWALD and HITZIG *in loc.*).

Ver. 7. **Tell me, thou whom my soul loveth, where feedest thou?** To this dreamy exclamation of longing desire for her still absent lover, the close of the preceding verse forms a thoroughly appropriate introduction. Despoiled of her freedom and her beloved home she can only then feel happy amid the new and splendid objects which surround her, when he from love to whom she has forsaken all and to whom her whole heart belongs, is actually close beside her.

הַגִּידָה לִּי "inform me" not "cause me to be informed," for הגיד always denotes an immediate declaration or announcement. This expression would manifestly be less suited to an address to a far distant lover. The paraphrase of the idea דוֹדִי by the fond circumlocution "whom my soul loveth" is found four times beside in the beautiful section iii. 1-4.—Shulamith represents her royal lover as "feeding" and then as "reclining" (or more exactly as "causing to recline," *viz.*, his flock) simply because, as a plain country girl, she supposes that she can directly transfer to him the relations and occupations of country life, and hence assumes that the king may now be somewhere in the fields with his flocks, and have sought with them some shady resting-place as a protection from the hot noon-day sun. That Solomon was just then residing in his pleasure grounds near Jerusalem, that is to say in the country, might favor this artless conception of hers (comp. above on ver. 5.) But the assumption of WEISSBACH is needless, that Solomon was then actually engaged in the over-sight of his flocks (Eccles. ii. 7) like Absalom and his brothers who, according to 2 Sam. xiii. 23, ff., were accustomed to manage the sheep-shearing themselves, and to convert it into a merry-making. Nothing further is to be sought in the expressions before us, than a ready trope from pastoral life, and consequently one of those criteria which mark this poem as at least a partially idyllic or pastoral drama (comp. Introduc. § 1, Rem. 3). That Joseph's going to the pasturage of his brethren, Gen. xxxvii. 15, 16, was what specially suggested the present figurative representation is too far-fetched, though asserted by HENGSTENBERG, and connected with his allegorical mode of interpretation. Parallels for this "reclining at noon" may better be adduced from the figurative language of the prophets, as Isa. xlix. 10; Ps. xxiii. 2; Ezek. xxxiv. 13-15, or even from the ancient classics, as THEOCRITUS, *Id.*, i. 14, 15; vi. 4; xxv. 216: HORACE, *Od.*, III. xxix. 21; VIRG. *Georg.* III. 324 ff.*

[* The introduction of these figures from pastoral life has occasioned much needless perplexity among interpreters. CLARKE says: "How this would apply either to Solomon or to the princess of Egypt, is not easy to ascertain. Probably in the marriage festival there was something like our masks, in which persons of quality assumed rural characters and their employments." Some have thought this to be a separate and independent composition, unconnected with the preceding in which the king was spoken of. So besides the German fragmentists, FRY, who begins a new idyl with ver. 7 on account of "the entire change of imagery." Others maintain that the unity of the poem is unbroken, but insist that the king and the shepherd are distinct persons; so GINSBURG and the entire class of interpreters to which he belongs, and extremes meeting here as not infrequently elsewhere, allegorical interpreters have gone so far in the same direction as to allege that these diverse representations are incompatible in application to any literal subject, and that no consistent sense can be made of them but by referring them to Christ. This, however, is to prejudice the beauty and perfection of the allegory, and to damage the spiritual interpretation of the Song itself. The author of the Song is not writing directly of Christ and His church, but only under the figure of a bridegroom and his bride. His language must, therefore, in all cases have immediate application to the latter, and can set forth the former only as the character and relations in which the more immediate subjects are presented, serve as their faithful image. If this image is distorted, wanting in consistency, and its various parts mutually discordant, the effect of the whole is marred, its beauty and its truth are defaced. It is at least safe to say that this is an assumption, which should not be made without necessity.

The objection to the explanation of the bride's language given by ZÖCKLER is, that it seems to impute to her the silly conceit that her royal husband or betrothed was actually engaged in the occupation of a shepherd, and it makes the reply by the daughters of Jerusalem utterly unmeaning. WITHINGTON presents three alternatives, the last of which is the only simple and natural one. This speech "may be a natural mistake of the rural lass on her first union with the king, or it may be the king went into her country to rusticate, or it may be an allegorical expression by which she signifies that the king is a shepherd and his kingdom is a flock." WILLIAMS: "If he be like a good shepherd feeding his flock, ad-

Digitized by Google

For why should I be as one straying? *etc.* כְּעֹטְיָה is very variously explained. עָטָה "to cover" is commonly regarded as its theme, and it is accordingly translated "as one veiled" [so Eng. Ver. margin] *i. e.*, as a harlot, Gen. xxxviii. 14, 15 (ROSENM., DEL.) [so THRUPP, BURROWES, NOYES]; or as. "one ashamed, veiled through shame" (UMBREIT, DÖPKE, HENGSTENBERG), or "as one unknown" (EWALD, HEILIGST., who compare the Arab. غطى *obscurus fuit, occultavit*) [WILLIAMS: as a stranger], or "as a mourner," (so some of the older commentators, as R. SOLOMON BEN MELEK, [AINSWORTH] after 2 Sam. xv. 30). [WEISS.: Muffled up as eastern women always were when exposed to the eyes of strangers, and as a shepherdess subject to insolent and injurious treatment from the shepherds, comp. Ex. ii. 16-19]. But the signification "cover" can no more be proved for עָטָה, than that of "pining away," which SCHULTENS (*Op. Min.* p. 240), ROCKE and others have sought to establish for the word. The Vulgate (*ne vagari incipiam*), SYMMACH. (ὡς ῥεμβομένη), SYR. and TARG., favor the meaning of *wandering* or *straying*, which is admirably suited to the context; [CLARKE: as a wanderer; one who not knowing where to find her companions wanders fruitlessly in seeking them.] In proof of it we shall not need BÖTTCHER's emendation כְּשֹׁטִיָּה ("as a country-stroller"), but simply HITZIG's assumption that עֹטְיָה by a transposition of the ע is for טֹעִיָּה (= תֹּעָה comp. Gen. xxxvii. 15); comp. רעף = ערף, עטף = Arab. ضعف *etc.*, (a view as old as KLEUKER *in loc.*, who with S. BOCHART actually proposes to read כְּטֹעִיָּה). The following expression "by the flocks of thy companions" is closely connected with this idea as the more exact limitation of the "straying." The "straying by the flocks of the king's companions," is nothing but a figure of speech for remaining among the throng of ladies in the royal court without the presence of the king himself; and that is just the veritably desolate and forlorn condition, from which Shulamith wishes to be released by the return of her lover. HITZIG arbitrarily explains the wandering of a wandering of her thoughts; and still more arbitrarily WEISSBACH seeks to give to עטה (with the following על for אל) the sense of "laying hands upon, purloining" ("that I, by the flocks of thy companions, be not regarded as one who will lay hands upon them," and for that reason is sneaking about them watching his opportunity.)

5. THE DAUGHTERS OF JERUSALEM.

Ver. 8. **If thou know not, fairest among women,** *etc.* This address (lit. "the fair (one) among the women," compare [GREEN's *Hebrew Grammar*, § 260, 2 (2)], EWALD, *Lehrbuch*, § 513, *c*) which is also used v. 9; vi. 1 by the "daughters of Jerusalem" in speaking to Shulamith, does not prove that the counsel here given "to follow the tracks of the flocks and pasture her kids beside the shepherds' huts" is a seriously meant exhortation to Shulamith to return to the condition of a shepherdess, or a friendly direction to her on her way to the royal flocks (WEISSB.). This language is evidently an "answer adapted to the narrow range of thought implied in Shulamith's question (which must necessarily appear foolish to the ladies of the court) and hence an unmeaning one, after which the fair shepherdess knew neither more nor less than she did before" (DEL.). It is therefore jeeringly intended, and if it did not exactly wound her deeply, it was certainly adapted to increase Shulamith's longing for her lover.—אִם־לֹא תֵדְעִי means neither "if thou do not know thyself" (SEPT., LUTH.), nor "if thou art deficient in understanding" (EWALD, HITZIG, *etc.*, who appeal to Isa. i. 8; lvi. 10, passages not appropriate in this connection), but conformably to the similar passage, vi. 12, "if thou know not," *viz.:* where thy lover feeds, this object being readily supplied from the context.—צְאִי־לָךְ בְּעִקְבֵי הַצֹּאן "go out at the heels of the flock," *i. e.*, go after it, follow its tracks, comp. Judg. iv. 10; v. 15. יָצָא therefore denotes here, as the Hiphil in Isa. xl. 26; 2 Sam. v. 2, going forth with the flock, not going out of the palace (VAIH., *etc.*).—"Thy kids," *i. e.*, the kids which as such an enthusiastic admirer of country life, and a shepherd's occupation you must certainly have. That she actually had some with her (WEISSB.) by no means follows from this expression.

6. SECOND SCENE. SOLOMON, vers. 9-11. The king has now returned from the engagements, which had hitherto detained him from his women, and he begins a tender conversation with Shulamith, who is favored by him above all the rest; during which the others withdraw into the background. Comp. No. 1, above.

Ver. 9. **To my horse in Pharaoh's chariots,** literally: "to my mare;" for סוּסָה can scarcely stand collectively for סוּסִים "horses, a body of horse," (VULG. "*equitatui*; HENGSTB., WEISSB., *etc.*), and there is nothing to justify its being pointed לְסוּסַי (MAGN., HITZ.). The singular לְסֻסָתִי evidently refers to a favorite mare of the king (comp. Zech. x. 8), to a particularly fine, and splendidly caparisoned specimen of those τέσσαρες χιλιάδες θήλειαι ἵπποι, which according to 1 Kin. x. 26, Sept., Solomon had for his chariots; and more exactly to such a steed used on state occasions in Solomon's "Pharaoh-chariots," *i. e.*, in those costly Pharaonic spans of horses, which according to 1 Kin. x. 28, 29, he had imported from Egypt. Solomon compares his beloved to this mare of his, harnessed and magnificently decorated before stately Pharaoh-chariots (not exactly before one of them, VATABL.), and that "on account of her youthful bloom and her unaffected demeanor, whose lovely charms are still further heightened by the simple ornaments worn upon her head and neck, vers. 10, 11" (DEL.). The point of the compa-

ministering public benefits and dispensing judgment, why should not I enjoy the common benefit? If he be indulging in retirement, why may not I, who am admitted as his wife, enjoy his company and conversation?"]

Digitized by Google

rison is not to be sought exclusively in the proud bearing of the horse, Job xxxix. 19, *etc.* (EWALD, VAIH., *etc.*), any more than in the glittering ornaments of his head and neck. In opposition to WEISSB., who thinks merely of the latter, and referring to HARTMANN's *Hebrüerin am Putztische*, (Hebrew woman at her Toilet), OLEARIUS "*Persische Reisen*" (Travels in Persia), *etc.* [see also HARMER's *Outlines*, p. 205, and the illustrations of a bride's dress, in CALMET's *Dictionary*] maintains that there was a marked similarity between the ornaments of pearls and chains worn by horses and by women in the East, and consequently by Shulamith in the present instance, it may be said that according to ver. 11 Solomon now first proposes to adorn his beloved with the proper gold and silver ornaments, and therefore she did not yet wear a burdensome head and neck ornament like a richly bridled mare.*—**My dear**; comp. i. 15; ii. 2; iv. 1, *etc.*, where the same familiar form of address recurs.

Ver. 10. **Comely are thy cheeks in chains.** תּוֹר kindred with דּוֹר, טוּר *etc.*, is equivalent to a circle, ring; in the plural consequently it denotes a chain composed of many rings, which goes around from the head under the chin, by which therefore the cheeks are encircled. Shulamith may not have brought this ornament together with the necklaces named in *b* (חֲרוּזִים kindred with חרז, חרס, little disks of metal or corals pierced and strung together) with her from the country, but may have received it as a present from Solomon since her coming to the royal court. Solomon, however, is not satisfied with this simple ornament, but promises her, ver. 11, much richer and more splendid jewels,—scarcely with the view of alluring her and binding her to his court (as even DEL. supposes) but simply to adorn yet more handsomely one who is so lovely, and to have his full pleasure in her as a magnificently attired princess.†

Ver. 11. **Chains of gold—with points of silver.** Needlessly, and quite too artificially, WEISSB. will have us understand by the נְקֻדּוֹת הַכָּסֶף something similar to the חֲרוּזִים little disks of silver pierced and strung together, which might be worn along with the gold chains. But עִם *with* by no means requires this explanation (comp. iv. 13): it rather leads to the far more natural assumption that the golden chains were dotted with silver "*punctis argenteis distincti*" (HITZIG).*

7. SHULAMITH vers. 12-14.

Ver. 12. **Whilst the king** (is) **at his table, my spikenard yields its fragrance.** If these words were to be translated: "whilst the king was at his table, my spikenard yielded its fragrance" (ROSENMUELLER, EWALD, HENGSTENB., VAIH., WEISSB., *etc.*), they could only mean: "as long as Solomon was absent, and did not burden me with his attentions, I was happy in the memory of my friend;" they would accordingly bear an emphatic testimony to the correctness of the herdsman or shepherd-hypothesis; for that the "fragrance of the spikenard" is to be taken literally and explained of the costly nard-oil on Shulamith's hair and garments, which had been as it were suppressed and far exceeded by the coming of her lover with his much more delightful fragrance (WEISSB.) is a very far-fetched explanation of these simple words.† They are rather to be taken as referring to the present, because the fact of there being no הָיָה *was* in the protasis makes against the preterite sense of נָתַן *give*‡ (comp. HITZ. in loc.) and because מֵסַב does not properly mean table, but rather company, festive assembly (comp. the adverbial use of the word in the singular, 1 Kin. vi. 29, and in the plural, 2 Kin. xxiii. 5; Job xxxvii. 12) and consequently points to the place where the king then was, to the women's apartment of his palace or park in contrast with his former stay in the fields, with the soldiers, on the chase, or elsewhere. The fragrance of Shulamith's nard is accordingly a figurative designation of the agreeable sensations or delightful feelings produced in her heart by the presence of her lover (comp. DEL.: "it only

* [CLARKE, BURROWES, and others adhere to the singular, "to my mare or steed." GOOD drops the pronoun: "one of the steeds," supposing the final yodh to be paragogic. So the common Eng. Ver., which takes the noun in a collective sense "company of horses," and is followed by the majority of English commentators, who find in this a proof of its allegorical meaning. The point of comparison according to the Westminster Assembly's Annotations is "comeliness," according to FRY "splendid decoration." POOLE, "An horse is a very stately and beautiful creature, and the Egyptian horses were preferred before others, and Pharaoh's own chariot horses were doubtless the best of their kind." THRUPP, WORDSWORTH, MOODY STUART suppose special allusion to the formidable character of Pharaoh's horses and chariots at the Red Sea, Ex. xiv. 9, 23. Several classic parallels have been adduced as THEOCRITUS, *Idyl*, xviii. 30; HORACE, *Odes*, iii. 11; SOPHOCLES, *Electra*, 25.—TR.]

† ["The mention of the Egyptian steed in ver. 9 naturally suggested the reference here made to the beautiful head-dress of the spouse." BURROWES. "Whether she be still compared hereby to a company of horses, as in ver. 9, or to a woman is doubtful, for both similitudes do agree to the things here spoken of. The bridles of horses are often adorned with rows (of jewels) especially in kings' chariots. Also the next words 'thy neck with chains' may have like reference; for the kings of Midian when they went to war had chains about their camels' necks, Judg. viii. 26." AINSWORTH, so too Gill. Of the ornament spoken of in the first clause AINSWORTH further says, "The same word תּוֹר is also used for a 'turtle-dove,' which some therefore take here to be jewels or ornaments that had the figures of 'turtle-doves.'" It is so in fact translated both in the SEPT. and VULG., followed by WICLIFFE and DOWAY, "thy cheeks are beautiful as the turtle-doves." So too CRANMER and BISHOPS: "thy cheeks and thy neck are beautiful as the turtle's." It is needless to say after the explanation given in the commentary that this rendering confounds two entirely distinct words.—TR.]

[* BURROWES adopts the conjecture of HARMER in his *Outlines*, p. 206, that this is the description of a crown. So MOODY STUART: These silver studded circles of gold mean either the royal or the nuptial crown, or both in one. PATRICK, WILLIAMS, TAYLOR make this the language not of the bridegroom, but of the attendant virgins.]

[† Much less so, however, than that which would make the nard refer to a distant shepherd lover, of whose existence there is no evidence. WEISS, who adopts the above rendering gives a peculiar turn to the thought: "The bride is supposed to have been provided with a bundle of spikenard, with which she intended to regale her bridegroom, when he entered the banqueting house or saloon, where the guests and the bride await him, and he approached to salute her according to custom. But unfortunately the bridegroom being detained a long time in another chamber by one of the guests, the bride's precious bundle of spikenard yielded all its fragrance, and became useless. When he enters, however, ver. 13 it is more than supplied by the delicious odors of the bridegroom's ointments and spices, which fill all the room." This belongs to his historical interpretation of it as an emblem of Israel's losing his pious fervor and lapsing into gross sin, while the Lord was with Moses on Mount Sinai, and the subsequent forgiving love and condescending grace of God.—TR.]

[‡ There is no need of departing from the preterite form of the Hebrew verb to obtain the sense desired. It should be rendered "Whilst the king has been (as he still is) with his company, my nard has yielded its fragrance."—TR.]

Digitized by Google

emits again that fragrance, which it has absorbed from his glances"), a representation which by no means sounds too refined and courtly for this simple country girl, this child of nature, which therefore HITZIG very needlessly puts (as well as ver. 13) into the mouth of an enamored court lady as a voluptuous piece of flattery for Solomon.* For נֵרְדְּ, which must here denote not a stalk of the well-known Indian plant Valeriana Jatamansi (MAGN., BÖTTCHER), but the aromatic unguent prepared from it, and that as poured out, and consequently emitting its fragrance, comp. WINER, *R. W. B.* Art., "Narde." [SMITH'S *Dictionary of the Bible*, Art. Spikenard. KITTO'S *Biblical Cyclopedia*, Art. Nerd].

Ver. 13. **A bundle of myrrh is my beloved to me.** Evidently an advance upon the figure of the fragrant nard. The royal lover, who now rests upon Shulamith's bosom, is compared by her to a parcel of the costly myrrh-gum such as the ladies of the East are in the habit of carrying in their bosom. צְרוֹר הַמֹּר is not a bunch [so NOYES] or sprig of myrrh (EWALD, DELITZSCH, *etc.*) for there is no more evidence of any aromatic quality in the branches and leaves of the myrrh tree than there is of its occurrence in Palestine at all. We must therefore think of a bundle or box (not exactly a flask, as WEISSB. proposes, contrary to the meaning of צְרוֹר) of semi-fluid, or fluid myrrh gum, and must besides compare the use of this gum as an unguent, which is vouched for also in v. 5, 13; Esth. ii. 12; Ex. xxx. 28. On the carrying of boxes of ointment by Hebrew women, comp. also Isa. iii. 20; Job xlii. 14, and HARTMANN, *die Hebräerin am Putztische* II., p. 280 f.

Ver. 14. **A cluster of cyprus is my beloved to me.** כֹּפֶר SEPT.: (κύπρος here and iv. 13) is the cyprus flower or Alhenna, which is indigenous to India, and probably to Egypt (PLINY, H. N. xii. 24) and may have been transplanted by Solomon in his vineyards at Engedi (on which comp. No. 1 above) for the sake of the peculiarly strong odor of its yellowish-white, grape-like clusters of flowers. [See HARMER'S *Outlines*, pp. 218-221; SHAW'S *Travels*, pp. 113, '4: SONNINI'S *Voyage*, pp. 291-302]. Comp. in respect to the fondness of oriental women for this aromatic plant the testimony of a recent traveller in the "Ausland," 1851, No. 17. "The white Henna-blossoms, which grow in clusters and are called Tamar-henna, have a very penetrating odor, which seems disagreeable to the European who is unaccustomed to it; but the Orientals have an uncommon liking for this odor, and prefer it to any other. The native women commonly wear a bouquet of Tamar-henna on their bosom." The Hebrew name of this plant might with Simonis and others be derived from כפר to cover, with allusion to the custom which prevails among Oriental women of staining their finger nails yellow with Henna powder, but it is more natural to refer כֹּפֶר as well as κύπρος and the Lat. *cuprum* to the Sanskrit root *cubh*, "to shine, be yellow," whence *cubhra*. The exact parallelism between ver. 13 and 14, and in general the intimate connection of vers. 12-14, with their figures taken without exception from the region of vegetable aromas further yields decided testimony against HITZIG'S division of the passage as though vers. 12, 13, belonged to one of the women of the Harem, and only ver. 14 to Shulamith.

8. SOLOMON, SHULAMITH, vers. 15-17.

Ver. 15. **Lo! thou art fair, my dear.** The fond ardor, with which she has just spoken of her lover, has doubled the expressive beauty of her features. The perception of this leads Solomon full of rapture to praise her beauty.—**Thine eyes are doves,** *i. e.*, not "thine eyes are doves' eyes," as though (like Ps. xlv. 7; 1 Kin. iv. 13, Ezra x. 13) the const. עֵינֵי were to be supplied; and the dove-like simplicity and fidelity of Shulamith's eyes were to be brought into the account as the point of comparison (VULG., SYR., IBN EZRA, VAT., GESEN., DEL., *etc.*), [Eng. Ver.]; but as is shown both by the context and the parallel passage, v. 12, "thine eyes resemble the lustrous and shimmering plumage of doves," wherein more particularly the white of the eyes is compared to that of the body, and the lustrous iris to the metallic lustre of the neck or wings of the dove (comp. Ps. lxviii. 14). Correctly therefore the Sept.: ὀφθαλμοί σου περιστεραί, and in the later times TARG., RASHI, HENGSTENBERG, HITZIG, *etc.*) [So HODGSON, WILLIAMS, FRY, THRUPP, *etc.*].

Ver. 16. **Lo! thou art fair, my beloved, yea sweet.** The exactly analogous form of expression, with which Shulamith here answers the flattering caresses of the king, makes it appear to the last degree forced to regard these words of hers as addressed to a distant lover. The climacteric אַף נָעִים "yes sweet, yes charming" is only the expression of her loving transport, and finds an illustrative commentary in the description ii. 3-5. [WILL., GINS. connect this adjective with what follows: "Lovely is our verdant couch"].—**Yea, our couch is green,** lit.: "greens, grows green" (רַעֲנָנָה) a reference to the stately, verdant, and refreshing natural surroundings, in the midst of which to their delight their loving intercourse now takes place, and perhaps more particularly to a shady grassplot under the trees of the park, upon which they were for the moment sitting or reclining; comp. § 1 above, and WEISSB. in loc. In opposition to HENGSTENB., who takes עֶרֶשׂ in the sense of

[* The meaning of this verse is differently given by COVERDALE: "When the king sitteth at the table, he shall smell my nardus." Her spikenard was not for her own gratification; she had perfumed herself with it for the king's sake alone, Esth. ii. 12, and it now gladly diffuses its fragrance in his presence to afford him pleasure. This FRY takes in its literal sense, supposing allusion to the throwing of flowers and perfumes as a token of high respect and complimentary congratulation. To this NOYES adds with an unnecessary degree of hesitation its emblematic sense: "It would seem to be too harsh a figure to suppose 'my spikenard' to mean 'my personal charms and graces' though such a supposition is favored by the next verse." AINSWORTH suggests the spiritual application: "In her and from her so adorned by her beloved, the odor of the Spirit of God in her, flowed forth and spread abroad to the delight of herself and others." THRUPP: "The symbolism of the Song of songs was outwardly acted, as is recorded in the gospels in the earthly life of the Lord Jesus, and is also permanently embodied in the worship of the Christian church. It was while He sat at table that the feet of our Saviour were on two separate occasions anointed, Luke vii. 36-50; John xii. 3 ff. And it is in the celebration of the Lord's Supper that the church still most solemnly presents her sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, which she beseeches God of His fatherly goodness to accept."—TR.]

Digitized by Google

"marriage-bed," and רַעֲנָן in a purely figurative sense of a gladsome and flourishing condition, may be urged that no mention can be made of a marriage-bed for Shulamith and Solomon before their nuptials, which are not described until iii. 6, *etc.*; likewise the contents of the following verses, especially ii. 1-3, which point to a continued stay of the lovers in the open air, under shady trees, and beside fragrant flowers.*

Ver. 17. **The beams of our houses are cedars, our wainscoting cypress-trees.** This can neither be the language of the "choir of women belonging to the harem" (BÖTTCHER), whose entrance here would be to the last degree disturbing; nor even of Solomon (HITZIG, WEISSB., REN.) to whom the beauty of the place where they are, is a matter of perfect indifference, by reason of the rapture with which he regards his beloved; but only that of Shulamith, the innocent, light-hearted child of nature, who has just begun to express her pleasure in that lovely spot in the open air, to which her lover had conducted her, and whose words would sound quite unfinished and end abruptly if nothing further were added to the commendation of their verdant couch.—"Cedars" and "cypresses," also named together Isa. xiv. 8; Zech. xi. 2, as costly species of wood for building and stately, lofty trees, are here evidently meant in the literal sense, of living trees of this description, such as were to be found, along with other rare and noble plants, in the royal gardens of a king so skilled in nature and so fond of splendor. The figurative part of her language lies rather in the "beams" and the "wainscoting" (רָהִיטִים from רהט = Ar. خرط "to hew," hence = *laquearia* of the VULG., wainscoting on walls and ceilings—not "pillars," WEISSB., nor "rafters," VATABL. and L. CAPPELL, [so E. V.], nor "floor," HENGSTENBERG, who prefers the K'ri רָהִיטִים). She, who had hitherto been without Solomon in the showy apartments of the palace, felicitates herself that she can now rest with him under the green trees of the garden, which seem to her to arch over them a far finer ceiling than those richly adorned halls. It is impossible to reconcile the mention of cedars, which only grew wild in Lebanon, not in central or northern Palestine, and consequently not in the vicinity of Shunem, with the shepherd hypothesis, whose advocates here find expressed Shulamith's longing for the verdure and shade of her home (*e. g.* EWALD, VAIH.).

9. SHULAMITH AND SOLOMON, ii. 1–7.

Ver. 1. SHULAMITH: **I am (only) a wild flower of Sharon, a lily of the valleys.** The connection with the preceding is not to be denied altogether (with DELITZSCH, who makes a new scene begin with this verse); still we must assume a pause of some length after i. 17, during which Shulamith who continues to tarry in the garden at the side of her lover, reflects upon her great good fortune in being selected to be the darling of the king, and by the comparison of the splendor which now surrounds her with the meadows and valleys of her home is disposed to humility and at the same time filled with longing for that simpler condition which she must forsake. She gives an artless as well as a delicate and striking expression to these feelings by calling herself "a wild-flower," a "lily of the valleys," which was not congruous to the many ornamental plants and artistic beauties of the royal court.*—Which flower of the plain of Sharon is intended by חֲבַצֶּלֶת הַשָּׁרוֹן, it is difficult to determine. Its identity with the "lily of the valley" (SEPT., VULG., and TARG. on Isa. xxxv. 1, the only other passage of the O. Test. in which חֲבַצֶּלֶת occurs), [CRAN., lily; so LEE], is contradicted by its being mentioned in a parallel with it, a circumstance which requires us to think of some similar plant, but one which is specifically different from it. If חבצלת were really connected with חמץ, "to be red" (comp. חָמוּץ *red*, Isa. lxiii. 1), as HITZIG, WEISSB., *etc.*, assume, the simplest course would be with AQUILA and R. KIMCHI on Isa. xxxv. 1, to translate it "rose," [so BISH., GENEV., E. VER.], and then to compare the combination of rose and lily in Ecclus. xxxix. 13, 14 as probably drawn from this passage. But another etymology, which supposes the word to be in some manner compounded with בָּצָל *onion* (whether ח is prefixed, which serves to form quadrilaterals, or the adj. חָמֵץ "sour," lurks in its initial letters), points rather to some bulbous plant, perhaps the meadow-saffron, which the Old Syriac seems to have intended (comp. MICH., EWALD, GESENIUS, *etc.*), [so ROYLE, WORDSWORTH, NOYES and THRUPP, who however translates it "daisy"], or the tulip (VELTHUSEN, MAGN., VAIH.), or the narcissus, for which last the Targ. already testifies with its נַרְקוֹס. As no one of these significations can be demonstrated with absolute certainty, it may be most advisable with the Sept. and Vulg. to abide by the indefinite "flower" [so Cov., Dow.], or

* ["The scene seems to be laid in the kiosk or summer-house in the royal garden. The green flowery turf is our place of repose; our canopy is cedar interspersed with fir, richly carved." BURROWES. Better still, GOOD: The lovers are not in a house, but a grove, where the spreading branches of the firs and the cedars are poetically called the beams and the roof of their chamber. Thus Milton, describing Adam's bower, *Par. Lost.*, iv. 692, comp. HOMER *Il.*, xxiv. 191. HARMER supposes ver. 16 to be the language of the bride, and ver. 17 that of the bridegroom. She commends the rural beauty of the spot in which they then were. He, impatient to introduce her to his palace, replies in substance: "Arise, my love, and quit this place, pleasant as it is, for equally pleasant and much more commodious will you find the abode to which I am conveying you, it being built of the fragrant cedar, and of other precious wood." POOLE, with many others, supposes the nuptial bed to be referred to "adorned with green garlands or boughs." AINSWORTH: "Green is not meant so much of color as of flourishing growth and increase."]

* [PATRICK, POOLE and DOWAY follow WICLIFFE and MATTHEWS in making ver. 1 the language of the bridegroom. The great body of commentators with better reason assign it to the bride. BURROWES: "Reclining thus on a bed of grass and flowers, the beloved and the bride naturally speak of each other in language drawn from the beautiful objects under their notice." Still more appropriately WILLIAMS: "The spouse with the most beautiful productions of the royal garden in her view, ventures to compare herself, not with them, but with the more humble natives of the fields and valleys." The "longing," which ZÖCKLER here finds for her home and former humble station, belongs purely to his theory of the plot in the Song, and has no place in the text itself.—TR.]

Digitized by Google

"wild-flower" [so WITHINGTON, GINSBURG]. Also in regard to the name Sharon שָׁרוֹן, it cannot be said decisively, whether it denotes the well-known plain along the coast between Cesarea and Joppa (Acts ix. 35), or the trans-jordanic plain named 1 Chron. v. 16, or finally a third meadow-land of Sharon between Tabor and the lake of Gennesaret mentioned by EUSEBIUS in the *Onomast*. This last might perhaps be most readily thought of on account of its vicinity to Shunem.*—Further חֲבַצֶּלֶת הַשָּׁרוֹן is, notwithstanding the article before שָׁרוֹן, to be translated "*a* wild-flower of Sharon" (comp. Gen. ix. 20; xxxv. 16; Jer. xiii. 4, *etc.*), and no conclusion can be drawn from this expression in favor of the allegorical explanation of Shulamith as the Church (against HENGSTENBERG).†—In both these comparisons, that with the flower of Sharon, and that with the lily (by which must be meant not the strongly scented *lilium candidum*, but rather as appears from i. 5, 6; v. 13 the Palestine red lily, *lilium rubens* of PLINY H. N. xxi. 5), the *tertium comparat.* is both the diminutive size of these plants compared with cedars, cypresses, *etc.*, and also their beauty and elegance (Matt. vi. 28; Luke xii. 27), so that, although Shulamith refers to her lowliness and rural simplicity, she yet says nothing derogatory to herself,‡ and quite in analogy with i. 5 manifests a certain self-regard though genuinely modest, and pure as a child.

Ver. 2. **As a lily among thorns, so is my dear among the daughters.** That which had been to Shulamith an expression of her lowliness is seized upon by Solomon with courtly skill in order to bring out of it the more emphatic praise of her grace and beauty. More strongly almost than afterwards in vi. 8, 9 he puts all other women in the shade in comparison with his chosen one, likening them to thorns, the well-known figure of whatever is mean, troublesome and offensive (comp. Judg. ix. 14; 2 Kin. xiv. 9; Isa. vii. 23, ff.; xxxii. 13; lv. 13; Ezek. ii. 6; xxviii. 24; Hos. ix. 6; x. 8; Ps. lviii. 10; Prov. xxii. 5, *etc*). [NOYES: "It is not implied that the lily grows among thorns, but that his love surpassed other women as much as the lily the thorn." MOODY STUART quotes the following as illustrative from BONAR: "Close by these lilies there grew several of the thorny shrubs of the desert; but above them rose the lily spreading out its fresh green leaf as a contrast to the dingy verdure of these prickly shrubs."] With the translation "rose" [so COV., CRAN.] (which is moreover absolutely inadmissible, since the fem. שׁוֹשַׁנָּה must unquestionably have a sense like that of the masc. שׁוּשַׁן or שׁוֹשָׁן "lily") the strong contrast intended would almost entirely vanish, for the thorns serve only to adorn the rose. RENAN regards this verse and ver. 7 as spoken by the shepherd (!) entering here for the first time ("*entrant brusquement en scène*")! [GINSBURG imagines that i. 15 is also spoken by this imaginary shepherd.—TR.]

Ver. 3. **As an apple-tree among the trees of the wood, so is my beloved among the sons.** Observe the exact parallelism of this sentence with ver. 2. Shulamith gives back the flattering commendation of her lover with a still closer adherence to his expressions than above in i. 16, and thus their conversation assumes the appearance of a "contest of mutually eulogistic love" (DELITZSCH). The reference of Shulamith's language to an absent lover, whom she praises in opposition to Solomon, who is indifferent or repulsive to her (EW., HITZ., VAIH., *etc.*), destroys the simple beauty of the dialogue. It is inadmissible to understand by the "apple tree (תַּפּוּחַ, Sept. μῆλον) some nobler fruit tree than the common *Pyrus malus*, as for instance, the quince (*Pyrus cydonia*), or the citron (*malus medica*) [so GOOD, WILLIAMS, TAYLOR, THRUPP, WITH.], or the orange (as is done by CELSIUS in his *Hierobot.* VELTHUS., ROSENM., VAN KOOTEN, *etc.*), on account of the mention made immediately afterwards (ver. 3*d*, and ver. 5) of the sweet fruit of the tree, because those acquainted with the East in former as well as in more recent times commend even the common apples of Syria and Palestine as an exceedingly generous fruit, of fine flavor and a pleasing fragrance (comp. HARMER, *Observations, etc.*,), and because the comparatively rare occurrence of תַּפּוּחַ in the Old Test., and its combination with the fig, pomegranate, palm, *etc.* (Joel i. 12; comp. Sol. Song vii. 9; viii. 5) point to its belonging to the nobler fruit-bearing plants of the flora of ancient Israel. [WORDSWORTH: It is a generic word (like *malum* in Latin), and may include the citron and lemon].—**In his shadow delighted I sit,** lit., "I delight and sit" (חִמַּדְתִּי וְיָשַׁבְתִּי) [GINS.: I delight to sit"], a construction like תַּרְבּוּ תְדַבְּרוּ 1 Sam. ii. 3, where the first verb seems to have only an adverbial force and the second expresses the principal idea,* comp. also below iv. 8; v. 6, and EWALD, *Lehrbuch*, § 285, *b*. [GREEN'S *Heb. Gram.* § 269]. Further it is no more necessary to take these verbs in a preterite sense here (EWALD, HITZ., *etc.*) than in i. 12, [strictly: I have been sitting and still sit.—TR.], so that this passage supplies no valid argument in favor of the shepherd hypothesis. In the figure of the sha-

* [HENGSTENBERG argues that "the valleys," which correspond in the parallelism with "Sharon," must also have the force of a proper name, and on the ground of 1 Chron. xii. 15, he decides that the valleys on either side of the Jordan are referred to. COV., GENEVA, DOWAY, FRY, THRUPP, WITH., GINS., follow the LXX in giving to Sharon an appellative sense: meadow, field or plain. The parallelism is, of course, not sufficient to justify either conclusion. GOOD finds an allusion here to her birth-place: "she was not of Egyptian origin, or royal descent, but a rose of the fields of Sharon—a native of Palestine." Of course the famous Sharon must be the one intended in such a passage as this.—TR.]

† [The article is always definite in Hebrew; and the only correct translation is therefore, "*the* flower of Sharon," where the article, however, is not to be taken in an eminent or exclusive sense, "*the* flower" *par excellence* (as WORDSWORTH: the flower of the whole earth; DOWAY: the flower of mankind) but has its generic sense, as is usual in comparisons. We may in conformity with our idiom substitute our indefinite for the Hebrew definite article in such cases, but this is by way of paraphrase, not exact translation. See GREEN'S *Heb. Gram.* § 245, 5, *d*.—TR.]

‡ If חבצלת really meant the "saffron," *Colchicum autumnale*, the comparison would contain what was damaging and degrading to Shulamith; but this is not admissible on account of the parallel, "lily of the valleys."

* [WORDSW. preserves the distinct verbal force of both words: "I long for his shadow and sit beneath it." COV.: "My delight is to sit under his shadow." ENG. VER.: "I sat down under his shadow with great delight." GENEVA: "Under his shadow I had delight and sat down."]

Digitized by Google

dow the point of comparison is not the protection afforded (as *e. g.* Ps. xvii. 8; xci. 1; Isa. xxv. 4, *etc.*), but the refreshing and reviving influence of the nearness of her lover, just as the sweet fruit of the apple-tree serves to represent his agreeable caresses, so iv. 16; vii. 14 (comp. WEISSB. *in loc.*).

Ver. 4. **He has brought me into his wine house.** בֵּית הַיַּיִן must be the same essentially as בֵּית מִשְׁתֵּה הַיַּיִן, that is to say, a room or apartment for drinking wine, a banquet hall [ENG. VER.], not a "wine shop" (! BÖTTCH.), or a "wine cellar" (VULG.: "*cella vinaria*," LUTH., REN., *etc.*), [COV., CRAN., GENEV., DOWAY, WILLIAMS], or a "vine-arbor" (VAIH., *etc.*), or a "vineyard" (EWALD, HEILIGST., *etc*). But so surely as the expressions in the context, especially the "fruit" of the apple-tree in ver. 3*d*, and the "banner" in 4 *b*, are to be understood figuratively, with the same certainty must the literal interpretation of "leading into the wine room" be rejected, and the sense of this expression must be found rather in an increased participation in the sweet tokens of his love, an intoxication from caresses (already essentially correct RUPERTI, DÖDERL., GESENIUS, DÖPKE, WEISSB., *etc.*). [So GOOD, NOYES. GINS.: "bower of delight."] The words need therefore neither be taken as a wish (SEPT., *εἰσαγάγετέ με εἰς οἶκον τοῦ οἴνου*, VELTH., AMM., HUG, UMBREIT, *etc.*), [so GOOD. FRY], nor as a narrative of what her country lover had previously done with her (EWALD, VAIH., BÖTTCHER), nor as the enthusiastic exclamation of a lady of the harem, who was now embraced by Solomon instead of the coy Shulamith (!! HITZ.), *etc.* There is no alternative but to regard it as a figurative description of the love which she had experienced from Solomon, having its most exact analogon in i. 4 *b*, "the king has brought me into his chambers." —**And his banner over me is love,** *i. e.* not "he bears his love as an ensign before me who follow him" (GROTIUS, HITZIG, WEISSB., *etc.*), [so NOYES, THRUPP, *etc.*], but "love waves as a protecting and comforting banner over my head (Ps. xx. 6) when I am near him." So correctly DÖPKE, DEL., [WORDSW., BURROWES]; also EWALD, VAIH., *etc.*, only the latter here again find described the love formerly enjoyed with her shepherd in the country. The banner (דֶּגֶל) is, wherever it occurs in the Old Test., a military figure (comp. besides Ps. xx. 6, also Num. i. 52; ii. 2, ff.). It must accordingly be explained here too in this sense, and not with BÖTTCHER of the sign before a wine shop (a tavern signboard!).*

Ver. 5. **Stay me with grapes, refresh me with apples.** The caresses of the king, who is clasping and embracing her (see ver. 6) produce an effect upon one so ardent in her love, which even if not "thoroughly agitating" (DELITZSCH), or "taking away her breath and almost stifling" (HOELEM), is yet powerfully exciting and as it were intoxicating, and directly wakens in her, probably for the first time since she came to the court, the consciousness that she is sick of love (comp. v. 8), and therefore needs to be strengthened by eating some refreshing fruit, or something of the sort. She directs her request for it, as is shown by the plurals סַמְּכוּנִי (literally, *fulcite me*, support me; comp. Gen. xxvii. 37; Ps. civ. 15), רַפְּדוּנִי, not to her lover himself (WEISSB.), but to the ladies of the court near her, to whom also the lively exclamation, ver. 7, is uttered. אֲשִׁישׁוֹת are neither aromatic unguents (SEPT., *μύρα*), nor flowers (VULG.: *fulcite me floribus* [so DOWAY]; so too SYMM., *etc.*), but agreeably to its probable derivation from אָשַׁשׁ "to found, to make firm" (see KNOBEL on Isa. xlvi. 8), pressed grapes, and so perhaps wine syrup, or better raisin cakes, grape cakes, which is favored both by the verb סָמַךְ and by the use of the word in Hos. iii. 1 (where the SEPT. translate, *πέμματα*), and in 2 Sam. vi. 19 (SEPT.: *λάγανον ἀπὸ τηγάνου*, pancakes).

Ver. 6. **His left hand is under my head and his right embraces me.** תְּחַבְּקֵנִי must not be taken in the optative here any more than in viii. 3, where the entire passage recurs, as though the sentence expressed a wish, "let his left hand be under my head and his right embrace me"* (EWALD, VAIH., WEISSB., *etc.*, [so GINSB.].—This is contradicted by the whole situation as well in this passage as in viii. 3. On the score of language too it is simpler and more natural to understand it as an indicative.

Ver. 7. "**I adjure you, ye daughters of Jerusalem,**" *etc.* In favor of Shulamith as the speaker in these closing words, it may be said: 1. That she is unmistakably the speaker of these words in iii. 5 and viii. 4, where as here they introduce a "pause in the action" of considerable length (EWALD). 2. That Shulamith already addressed the ladies of the court in ver. 5, who must accordingly be supposed to be near at hand as spectators of her joy. 3. That what she has said of her being "sick of love" prepared the way for this adjuration, and the latter is well-nigh unintelligible without reference to the former. We may from the outset, therefore, repel the attempts to treat the verse as the language of the queen mother, who enters here (! BÖTTCH.), or of the celestial Solomon (HENGSTENB., after many older expositors as STARKE, JO. LANGE, *etc.*), or of the poet (UMBR., HITZIG),† or, finally of the shepherd speaking to the chorus (! RENAN). "I adjure you," literally, I cause you (as much as in me is) to swear, I exact from you the sacred promise, I earnestly beg you.‡ Compare Gen. l. 5; Num. v. 19. **By**

* [The meaning of this clause is well expressed by COVERDALE: He loveth me specially well. DOWAY has: He hath ordered in me chastity. PARKHURST, without reason, supposes a reference to "a light or lamp, such as was carried before the new-married couple on the evening of their wedding, comp. Matt. xxv. 1–2."]

* [THRUPP insists on the future sense: The time shall come when that sickness of love, of which I now complain, shall be solaced and satisfied. TAYLOR makes vers. 4–6 the protasis of the sentence completed in ver. 7, "when he brings me, *etc.*, when his left hand is, *etc.*, I adjure you," *etc.*]

† [GILL, PATRICK, SCOTT and WILLIAMS make this the language of the bridegroom; the great body of English commentators refer it to the bride.—TR.]

‡ [WITHINGTON, in accordance with his supposition that the bride is the daughter of an Arab chief, whose adjuration is consequently by the roes and hinds of her native fields, remarks: "The semi-paganism of the oath is extremely natu-

Digitized by Google

the gazelles or by the hinds of the field. These animals are not named in the adjuration, because animals generally in contrast with men have "fixed annual rutting seasons" (HITZIG; likewise also HERDER and others); nor because the ladies of Jerusalem were in the habit of keeping little pet gazelles (J. D. MICH.), nor on account of the resemblance of צְבָאוֹת and אַיְלוֹת הַשָּׂדֶה to the divine names יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת and אֱלֹהֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם (WEISSB.); but doubtless on account of their pretty and graceful appearance (comp. Prov. v. 19), which makes these animals in particular fit symbols of tender and ideal love, and must make them especially dear to women in this point of view. Comp. particularly DÖPKE *in loc.*, likewise EWALD: "In common life people swore by things, which belonged to the subject of conversation, or were especially dear to the speaker. As therefore the warrior swears by his sword, as Mohammed by the soul of which he is just about to speak (Kor. ch. xci. 7), so here Shulamith by the lovely gazelles since she is speaking of love."*—**That ye wake not nor awaken love until it please.** אִם תָּעִירוּ, literally, "if ye wake," *etc.* (EWALD, § 325, *b*), [GREEN'S *Heb. Chrestomathy* on Gen. xlii. 15]. The verb is here masc., corresponding to אֶתְכֶם in *a*, not because the daughters of Jerusalem were not real female personalities, as HENGSTENBERG [so too WORDSWORTH] insists, but because the primary gender is here used as common, as in ver. 5 above, and Judg. iv. 20; Isa. xxxii. 11; and frequently in the imperative. [THRUPP explains it by "the general indefiniteness of the character which the daughters of Jerusalem as members of the chorus here sustain." But see GREEN'S *Heb. Gram.* § 275, 5.—TR.]—הָאַהֲבָה is certainly not "the loved one," as though the warning here were not wantonly to wake Shulamith who had fallen asleep (VULG. *dilectam*, SYR., GESEN., EWALD, ROSENM., HENGSTENB., RENAN and J. D. MICHAELIS who for the sake of this sense points הָאֲהוּבָה), but as this meaning would be in the highest degree unsuitable in the parallel passages iii. 5 and viii. 4, and as love as an ethical idea comes significantly forward elsewhere in this poem (vii. 7 and viii. 6 f.), it is manifestly love itself as a passion slumbering in the heart, which it would not do over-curiously to rouse or kindle to a flame. הָעִיר הָאַהֲבָה cannot possibly mean "disturbing love" before it has attained full satisfaction of its desire for converse with the beloved object (DELITZSCH, WEISSB.), for it certainly expresses something analogous to הָעִיר קִנְאָה "stir up jealousy" Isa. xlii. 13, and the Pi. עוֹרֵר, which is added to strengthen it, always and only has the sense of exciting or awakening *e. g.* strife, Prov. x. 12, strength or power, Ps. lxxx. 3, *etc.* Comp. also *irritata voluptas*, *irritamenta amoris seu veneris* in Latin poets (*e. g.* OVID, *de arte am.* 2, 681; *Metam.* 9, 133; JUVEN. 11, 165); although here we are certainly not to think of any magic charms or philters to inflame love or lust, such as love apples, Gen. xxx. 14, *etc.*, or quinces (BÖTTCHER). The meaning of the admonition is rather simply this: "Plunge not rash and unbidden into the passion of love, that is to say not before love awakes of itself (till heart is joined to heart, till God Himself awakens in you an affection for the right man), be not forward to excite it in your hearts by frivolous coquetry or loose amorous arts." This caution may in some measure be regarded as the moral of the entire poem, inasmuch as it aims at the preservation of the chaste, truly moral, and consequently truly natural, character of love. It is, therefore, most suitably put into the mouth of Shulamith as the bearer or representative of such pure ethical love in contrast with the women of Solomon's court.* Comp. the like sentence viii. 7 *b*.

---

ral." MOODY STUART: "This is no oath by the hinds of the fields, but a solemn charge with the strength of an oath." WILLIAMS infers, from a comparison of Gen. xxi. 30, that the "antelopes and hinds of the field" are referred to as witnesses of this solemn adjuration made in their presence.—TR.]

[* HENRY: "She gives them this charge by everything that is amiable in their eyes and dear to them." FRY: "The bride bids her attendants to be cautious not to disturb or call off the attention of her husband, whose society she has so coveted, as though they were approaching the gazelles or the deer of the plain." TAYLOR and BURROWES likewise find the point of the allusion in the timorousness of these animals. GILL and SCOTT combine both: "They are gentle and pleasant creatures, but exceedingly timorous." WORDS.: "The roes and hinds love their mates with tender affection and steadfast reliance and will not disturb them in their slumbers."]

*[This surely cannot be accepted as a satisfactory explanation of this difficult verse. The spontaneity of love, which no effort must be made to awaken, but which must be excited of itself, so far from being accounted a worthy lesson of divine revelation, is not even a doctrine of ethics, and would require considerable qualification before it could be admitted to be sound rational advice. If inspired instruction were to be given on the subject of conjugal love, and a whole book devoted to the treatment of it, we might reasonably expect that its constancy, purity and strength would be prominently dwelt upon, that due attention would be paid to the qualities on which it should be based, the affectionate offices by which it should be maintained, and the holy principles by which it should be regulated. But instead of all this the one thing insisted upon is that love must be spontaneous and unsolicited. What is this but to convert it into heedless, inconsiderate passion, the spring of ill-judged attachments, which prove as inharmonious in their issue as they were irrational in their origin? This is, besides, a very different thing from the theme of this book, as ZÖCKLER himself conceives and represents it, which is the commendation of a pure and chaste conjugal affection as opposed to the dissoluteness and sensuality fostered by polygamy. It would also be a most extraordinary admonition for Shulamith to the daughters of Jerusalem, among whom, according to ZÖCKLER'S hypothesis were the wives of Solomon, married to him long before Shulamith had ever seen him.

Then besides the feebleness and inappropriateness of the sense obtained, it is doubtful whether the language of the verse can be made to yield it. The expressions thus explained are exceedingly vague. There is nothing to indicate in whom they are cautioned not to awaken love, whether in themselves or others; or in what way—may they not in any way seek to win another's affection or to excite their own, not even by exhibiting or discerning what is worthy of regard? And "till it (*i. e.*, love) please," is to say the least an unexampled phrase. It is a very singular form of speech for any one to adopt: "do not excite a passion until that passion is willing to be excited."

Of the English commentators, who take "love" in its subjective sense of the feeling or emotion, GINSBURG under the bias of the unfounded shepherd-hypothesis translates: "neither to excite nor to incite my affection till it wishes another love," the words "another love" being introduced without any warrant from the text or context. PATRICK paraphrases thus: "I conjure you not to discompose or give the least disturbance to that love; but let it enjoy its satisfaction to the height of its desires." So substantially TAYLOR and THRUPP. WEISS.: "if ye disturb this love until it shall become complete, *i. e.*, until the marriage be consummated." But the verbs here employed mean to awaken or excite, not to disturb. It seems better, however, with the great body of interpreters to take "love" here as in vii. 6 in its objective sense of one who is beloved. WORDSWORTH compares "the words of S. IGNATIUS *ad Rom.* 7, ὁ ἐμὸς ἔρως ἐσταύρωται." The bride is locked in the fond embrace of him whom she loves. She would not have him aroused by the intrusion of

Digitized by Google

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The allegorical interpretation current in the Church regards all the particulars in the foregoing description of the loving intercourse between the bridegroom and the bride, as allusions veiled under mystical figures to the relation of Christ to the Church and further to the soul of the individual Christian. It sees in the opening words of Shulamith i. 2-4 a manifestation of the longing of the Church for union with her heavenly bridegroom, whilst the partial identification or combination of Shulamith with the other virgins was especially designed to indicate that the speaker was an ideal person as well as her lover, who is now addressed, now mentioned in the third person, and who forms the object of her longing desire. It further supposes in what Shulamith says vers. 5, 6 of her "blackness" and of her "not having kept her own vineyard," references to the sins of the church, as the causes of her temporary separation from God and her enslavement by the empire of this world; and accordingly finds, in ver. 7, a prayer to be informed respecting the way which leads back to communion with God and Christ, in ver. 8 a statement of this way vouchsafed to her by divine grace; vers. 9–17 depict the emulous contest of love, which proceeds between the Church penitently returned to her heavenly bridegroom and Christ, who graciously receives her; in which the cordial promptness and address, with which the bride immediately repeats in application to her bridegroom everything said in her praise, indicate the faith of the Church working by love and making constant progress in holiness. Then in ii. 1—7, it is alleged that "declarations of love advance to the enjoyment of love," and this latter is represented in ver. 6 as having already attained its acme under the emblem of an embrace, or of the nuptial couch. The epiphonema in ver. 7 brings the entire development to its conclusion, and shows by its twofold recurrence subsequently in iii. 5 and viii. 4, that the same subject is treated in successive cycles, and the process by which the loving union of Christ with the Church is effected is thus repeatedly symbolized under an allegorico-dramatic veil, varied with every iteration.—So among the more recent allegorizers, *e. g.*, HENGSTENBERG (pp. 2 ff., 24 ff., 36 ff.), with whom the rest, as HAHN, HOELEMANN, *etc.*, agree in everything essential, and particularly in the assertion of a cyclical mode of presentation, by which the dramatic unity of the whole is fundamentally destroyed, and several successive tableaux or portraitures of character are assumed, all relating to the same subject (or as HAHN expresses it, each "serves to supplement or further explain" its predecessors). Similarly the older allegorical interpreters, only they go into more detail in the mystical exposition of the individual figures, and see *e. g.* in the bundle of myrrh, i. 13, a reference to Christ's bitter passion, or to His perfect sacrifice for the sins of men (comp. STARKE *in loc.*), whereby consequently an allusion to His *munus sacerdotale* is added to that to the *munus propheticum* (i. 7, Christ as shepherd), and *regium* (i. 12, Christ as king); or expound the "golden bracelets" i. 11 of the growth of faith, the "silver points," in the same passage, of holiness of life; or hold the "wine cellar" ii. 4 to be an emblem of Christian churches and schools as "houses of wisdom," or see in it whether "the altar of the Church, where the body and blood of Christ are dispensed," or the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, with their various sorts or stages of divine revelation.*

2. In opposition to such aimless and unbridled

---

others to the interrupting or abridging of her joy. POOLE, with an eye to its spiritual application: "Do not disturb nor offend him by your miscarriages." WORDS.: "The church conjures her children that they be not impatient but wait in faith and hope for God's own time, when it may please Him to arise and deliver her."—TR.]

* [GENEVA BIBLE, note on i. 2: "This is spoken in the person of the Church or of the faithful soul inflamed with the desire of Christ, whom she loveth." AINSW.: "The bride is the Church espoused to Christ." In i. 2 she "desireth to have Christ manifested in the flesh, and to have the loving and comfortable doctrines of His gospel applied unto her conscience." "By virgins (ver. 3) are meant all such (whether whole churches or particular persons) who with chaste and pure minds serve the Lord only." The daughters of Jerusalem are "the friends of Christ and His Church, the elect of God, though not yet perfectly instructed in the way of the Lord." The bride's blackness (ver. 5) is "the Church's afflictions and infirmities." Her mother's sons, "either false brethren, false prophets and deceivers, or inordinate lusts and sins which dwelt in her, and were conceived with her." "The vineyards opposed to her own vineyard seem to mean false churches, and in them the corruption of religion, whereunto her mother's sons sought to draw her; setting her to observe the ordinances and traditions of men, or otherwise to undergo their cruelty and wrath." In ver. 7 "the Church maketh request unto Christ for instruction in the administration of His kingdom here on earth." BURROWES regards this section as exhibiting, in successive steps, "the progress of the pious soul in the enjoyment of Christ's love and favor." 1. We enjoy the love of Jesus as manifested in private communion "in His chambers," i. 4. 2. In the way of duty and self-denial, i. 7–11. 3. In sitting with the King in the circle of His friends, and enjoying, as one of them, the delights of social communion with Him, i. 12–14. 4. In delightful repose with Him, amid enlarged prospects of spiritual beauty, i. 15–17. 5. In the protection and delights set forth in ii. 1–3. 6. In enjoying at last the pleasures mentioned in ii. 4–7, the greatest possible on earth."

WORDSW. finds expressed in i. 2 "the fervent yearnings of the Church for the advent of Christ." "The mother of the Bride (*i. e.*, of the Church of Christ) is the Jewish nation, and her mother's children are Jews or Judaizers. It was the delinquency, ingratitude and cruelty of the "mother's children" which made the Christian Church become the "keeper of the vineyards."

According to THRUPP, "the Church of Israel, in i. 2, desires the very presence of her Saviour. She had been instructed and wooed through the messages of the prophets; she desired now that her promised Messiah should pour into her mouth words from His own mouth." The daughters of Jerusalem are "the members of the Church of Israel in their contemplative capacity; not necessarily different persons in their outer being from the virgins of ver. 3 (the upright), but yet representing them in a different point of view, with reference solely to their intelligent and emotional survey of what is passing, and without regard to their own spiritual state." The mother of the Bride is the nation of Israel. The mother's sons are "the several members of the nation, viewed only in their civil dealings, in their relation to the State, not in their relation to the Church." Their anger was the rebellion of the ten tribes. Her own vineyard was the religious culture of all Israel. Hindered in this by the political condition of the nation, she was driven to the establishment of colleges of holy disciples, the sons of the prophets at different centres, whose spheres of action are denoted by the vineyards, of which the anger of her brethren made her the keeper. WEISS refers this section to the time when Israel lay encamped at the foot of Sinai. The blackness of the bride (i. 5) was the sin of the golden calf, the sun that occasioned it was the bondage in Egypt. The petition (ver. 7) concerns the leading through the wilderness, and the house (ver. 17) is the tabernacle of Moses. MOODY STUART supposes the longing for Christ's appearance, and His actual birth among men, to be the subject of this section; his interpretation of which is specialized even to the extent of making the "green bed" of i. 16 refer to the fresh grass upon which the newly-born Saviour was laid in the manger for the cattle.

Digitized by Google

trifling, which lays no sure historical and exegetical foundation at the outset, and hence supposes that it can bring every possible mystery into the simple language of this poem, an unprejudiced historical exposition can see nothing in the section explained above, but the first act of a more prolonged lyrico-dramatic action, which by a gradual progress brings to its denouement the relation of two lovers, king Solomon and a fair Israelitish maiden, whose previous condition was that of a shepherdess or a vine-dresser. *The development in this first section is not carried beyond the exhibiting a decided ethical contrast between the character of this maiden and that of the daughters of Jerusalem, i. e., the ladies of Solomon's court or harem, and the knitting in addition of a firm bond of loving heart-communion between her and the king, who for her sake already begins to contemn all the others, and even to find them unlovely* (see ii. 2). It is not exactly the very first of the "mutual attachment" of the two lovers (Delitzsch), but it is the first consciousness in both of the incomparable strength and ardor of their reciprocal affection (see particularly ii. 5, 6), which is exhibited in this act, together with the first evident cropping out of an inner contrariety between this closely united pair and the other persons of the court; and this is brought by the principal person in the piece to the briefest and most emphatic expression possible, by the remark at the close in ii. 7, as a contrast of true and false love, or that which "awakes of itself," and that which is "excited" by amorous arts.*

3. Only thus much can be maintained as the well assured result of a sober, yet earnest-minded exposition of this first division, which keeps aloof from the profane assumptions and artificial combinations of modern shepherd-romances and amatory poems; and it is simply on this basis, therefore, that a practical application of the contents of this chapter and a half must proceed, if it is to be conducted upon sound and worthy principles. Its aim must consist essentially in pointing out and devoutly estimating the typical analogy which undeniably holds between what is here found and the dealings of the Redeemer with His Church. As Solomon raised his beloved from a low condition to his own glory, and that from mere love, and drawn by her beauty and charms, so the Lord has exalted man, sunk in misery and degradation, from no other motive than His love, His mere personal regard for our race, upon which His divine glory and blessedness were in no manner dependent; for

"Nothing brought Him from above,
Nothing but redeeming love."

As further Solomon's love to Shulamith appears in a gradual growth and a progression by successive steps, so too Christ lifts both His entire church and the individual souls that compose it, only step by step to the full and complete fellowship of His grace. To the call into His kingdom, which corresponds with the establishing of the relation of conjugal love in the royal gardens at Jerusalem represented in this act, succeed the higher stages of illumination, conversion, sanctification; but they do not follow immediately upon the heels of the former. As finally the lovely combination of child-like humility and of inward longing for her beloved, which Shulamith's character already exhibits in this first Song, forms her chief attraction which first makes her appear truly worthy of the love of her royal bridegroom, so in the soul of every Christian whom the Lord calls into His kingdom and will make partaker of His grace, the necessity of surrendering himself voluntarily to these gracious drawings with a hearty desire for a complete union with him becomes His highest duty; for "*non visi volentes trahuntur a Deo*" (Matt. xxiii. 37.)—Besides these analogies a sound and sober practical exposition of this section must also hold up the numerous points of difference between the historical type and the soteriological and Messianic antitype; and among these it must particularly point out the dissimilitude, nay the contrast between the earthly Solomon, and the divine-human Redeemer, as well as between the surroundings of both. For it is only in this way that the total of what is contained in this action can be duly developed and converted to practical profit in both a positive and a negative respect. Comp. Introduction, § 4, pp. 16 ff.

* [The contrast in character, which Zöckler finds already indicated in this section between Shulamith and the daughters of Jerusalem, though essential to his scheme of the book, is purely imaginary. It certainly is not established by ii. 2, the only passage that can, with the slightest plausibility, be urged in its favor; whilst i. 3 and 4 speak decisively against it.

Whether the cyclic or the dramatic view of this book is to be preferred, may be left an open question at this stage of the exposition. If our author succeeds in showing a continuous progress in the action from first to last, the latter view is of course entitled to the preference. But if he fails in this, as in the translator's judgment he does, and as all have done who have made the same attempt before him, we seem to be shut up to the former; unless indeed even the cyclic view, at least as refined by some of its later advocates, is too artificial for the artless simplicity of this beautiful poem, in which the same theme recurs under varied aspects, but the law of succession is rather that of poetical association than logical exactness.

And the general character of this section creates an antecedent presumption favorable to this view. The intimacy here described is of the strictest and most loving nature, and seems to leave no room for any further advance. Instead of preparing the way for a married union, it rather implies that the marriage has already taken place. The "bed" i. 16 is in all probability not the nuptial couch. But Shulamith's presence in the king's apartments, the kisses and embraces, her open expression of her passionate fondness for the king would be unbecoming and inadmissible, especially amid the restraints of oriental society, prior to marriage.—Tr.]

Digitized by Google

SECOND SONG.

The first meeting of the lovers, related by Shulamith who has returned to her home.

CHAP. II. 8—III. 5.

FIRST (and only) SCENE:

SHULAMITH (alone).

8 Hark![1] my beloved; lo! here he comes,
leaping[2] over the mountains,
bounding over the hills.
9 My beloved is like a gazelle
or a young hart.[3]
Lo! here he stands behind our wall,[4]
looking through[5] the windows,
glancing through the lattices.[6]
10 Answered my beloved and said to me:
"Up,[7] my dear, my fair one and go forth!
11 For, lo! the winter is past,
the rain is over, is gone.
12 The flowers appear in the land,
the time for song[8] has arrived,
and the voice of the turtle dove is heard in our land.
13 The fig-tree spices[9] its green figs
and the vines are in bloom,[10] they yield fragrance,
[11]up! my dear, my fair one and go forth!
14 My dove, in the clefts[12] of the rock,
in the recess of the cliffs,[13]
let me see thy form,[14] let me hear thy voice,
for thy voice is sweet and thy form is comely."—

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

1 [WIC. heading: The voice of the church of Christ. MAT.: The voice of the church. COV.: Methink I hear the voice of my beloved. So CRAN., BISH.]

2 "Whilst the verb דלג suggests his long leaps, as he springs, comp. Isa. xxxv. 6; Ps. xviii. 30; Zeph. i. 9, the verb קפץ (an older form for קפּז and related to קמץ *to press together*, as well as to קבץ *to gather*; in the Piel "to cause to draw together") lets us, as it were, see the gazelles, with which the lover is compared, as in galloping they draw their feet together again, after being stretched so wide apart." WEISSB.

3 [AINS.: a fawn of the hinds]

4 כֹּתֶל according to the Targ. on Josh. ii. 15 equivalent to קִיר "wall" occurs nowhere else in the Old Testament except in the Chaldee forms כְּתַל Dan. v. 5, and (plur.) כֻּתְלַיָּא Ezr. v. 8.

5 [E. Ver.: "forth at." COV.: better "in at." WORDS.: "spying in at the windows."]

6 [COV.: peepeth through the grate. AINS.: flourishing through the lattices.]

7 The two-fold לָךְ *to thee* after קוּמִי *arise* and after לְכִי *go*, throws back the action, as it were, upon its subject and thus serves to impart to the language an easy, colloquial and kindly character, comp. i. 8, also vers. 11, 13, 17; iv. 6; viii. 14. WEISSBACH correctly remarks that it is chiefly verbs of motion to which this kindly לָךְ or לִי or לָמוֹ is added. [MAT.: The voice of Christ.]

8 [E. Ver.: "singing *of birds*," which HARMER refers especially to the nightingale. WIC.: "cutting." COV.: the twisting time. DOWAY: "pruning," so THRUPP and WEISS. POOLE: cutting or cropping for nosegays.]

9 [So NOYES. COV.: bringeth forth. E. Ver.: putteth forth. GOOD, GINSB.: sweeten. WILLIAMS: ripen. FRY: embalm. WEISS: perfume. THRUPP: mature.]

10 [WIC.: flowering. COV.: blossoms, so FRY, NOYES, THRUPP. DOWAY: flower. E. Ver.: tender grapes; so GOOD, WEISS, GINSB. WILLIAMS: tender buds.]

11 [WIC.: The voice of Christ to the church.]

12 חַגְוֵי הַסֶּלַע appears here as well as in Obad. ver. 3; Jer. xlix. 16, which are probably derived from the passage before us, to be not rocky heights, lofty refuges on top of the rocks, (SCHULT., GESEN., HENGSTENB., WEISSB., *etc.*,) but rather "fissures, clefts in the rocks" (comp. EWALD and HITZIG *in loc.*) For the latter figure manifestly agrees better with the present situation, (see ver. 9) and may also have a better etymological basis (comp. Arab. خَجَّ to split.)

13 מַדְרֵגוֹת (from דרג kindred to דרך) comp. Ezek. xxxviii. 20, the only other passage in which the word occurs.

14 On the form מַרְאַיִךְ as a singular, comp. EWALD, § 256 *b*, [GREEN'S *Heb. Gramm.* § 221, 7 *a*.]

Digitized by Google

15 Catch[1] us foxes,
little foxes, spoiling vineyards;
for our vineyards are in bloom.
16 My beloved is mine, and I am his,
who feeds among the lilies.
17 Against[2] the day cools, and the shadows flee
turn thee, my beloved, and be like
a gazelle or a young hart
on the cleft[3] mountains.

(*She sleeps and after some time awakes again:*)

III. 1 [4]On my bed[5] in the nights[6]
I sought him whom my soul loves;
I sought him but I found him not.
2 "I will rise now and go about in the city
in the markets and in the streets;[7]
I will seek him whom my soul loves."—
I sought him but I found him not.
3 Found[8] me the watchmen, who go about in the city;
"[9]Whom my soul loves, have ye seen?"[10]
4 Scarcely[11] had I passed from them,
when I found him whom my soul loves.
I grasped him and would not let him go,
until I had brought[12] him into my mother's house,
and into the chamber of her that conceived[13] me.—
5 I[14] adjure you, ye daughters of Jerusalem,
by the gazelles or by the hinds of the field,
that ye wake not and that ye waken not
love until it please.

1 [Wic.: The voice of Christ to the church against heretics. Mat.: The voice against the heretics.]

2 [Adopted from Thrupp.]

3 [E. Ver. marg: division, but in the text: Bether, as though it were a proper name which Patrick identifies with Bethel; Ainsworth and Poole with Bithron; and Clarke with Beth-horon. Cov.: simply, "mountains" omitting Bether. Bish., Cran.: wide mountains. Parkhurst, Williams: craggy mountains. Burrowes: a region cut up or divided by mountains and valleys, rough, craggy and difficult to cross. With.: our secluded hills.]

4 [Wicliffe's heading: The voice of the church gathered together of Gentiles. Mat.: The voice of the church which is chosen out of the heathen.]

5 [Wic.: little bed.]

6 [So Ains.; Wic., by nights. Mat., E. Ver., by night.]

7 שְׁוָקִים plur. of שׁוּק, as דּוּרִים from דּוּר [Green's *Heb. Gramm.* § 207, 1. f.] related to שָׁקַק *to run* (whence also שׁוֹק *leg*) denotes "places where people run," bustling public places, hence the Sept. correctly *ἐν ἀγοραῖς*. Comp. Eccles. xii. 4, 5; and Prov. vii. 8.—For רְחֹבוֹת *streets* (*πλατείαι*) comp. Prov. i. 20; vii. 12. Without sufficient proof from the language Weissbach claims for this latter expression the meaning "markets, open squares," and for the former the meaning "streets." [Wic.: by towns and streets. Cov.: upon the market and in all the streets. Genev.: by the streets and by the open places. E. Ver. in the streets and in the broad ways. Patrick: שְׁוָקִים are the lesser thoroughfares in the city or the streets of lesser cities; as רְחֹבוֹת are the greater, wider streets, or rather the streets of the royal capital city.]

8 On מָצָא "to strike upon any one, find, meet him," 1 Sam. x. 3; Song Sol. v. 7.

9 [Wic. The church saith of Christ to the apostles. Mat.: The church speaking of Christ.]

10 The interrogative particle הֲ is omitted before the verb רְאִיתֶם, because it is at so great a remove from the beginning of the clause. Comp. Ewald, *Lehrbuch*, § 314 *a*, *b*.

11 On כִּמְעַט (מְעַט with כְּ *veritatis*) "as much as a little." Comp. Isa. i. 9.

12 On the form שֶׁהֲבֵיאתִיו for שֶׁהֲבֵאתִיו see Hitzig *in loc.* [Green's *Heb. Gram.*, § 160, 2.]

13 הוֹרָתִי synonym of אֵם as Hos. ii. 5.

14 [Wic.: The voice of Christ to the church. Mat.: The voice of Christ.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. It is the fixed opinion of almost all the more recent interpreters that this act contains two monologues or sonnets sung by Shulamith alone, and nothing more; and this is verified by all the particulars that it contains. The attempt of Magnus and Delitzsch to strike out as spurious the formula of citation ii. 10 אָמַר דּוֹדִי וְאָמַר לִי and so to gain a dialogue form for the first and larger division (ii. 8-17) is wrecked not only by the evidence of genuineness afforded by all MSS. and ancient versions in favor of these words, but also by the closing verses of the section (vers. 15-17) which correctly interpreted represent her lover as present only to the imagination of Shulamith or to her memory, which vividly recalled

Digitized by Google

him. Whether the two monologues are regarded as two distinct scenes, (as is commonly the case), or the scene is allowed to remain the same in both without change and only a pause of some length is interposed between them (EWALD, HITZ., HAHN,) is on the whole but an unessential difference. For a pause after ii. 17 is as undeniable and as universally admitted as is the peculiar character of the second sonnet iii. 1-5, which as the narration of a dream (with the apostrophizing of the daughters of Jerusalem therewith connected) is sharply and distinctly sundered from the preceding monologue, though this too is of a narrative character. As to what takes place between the two monologues or scenes, we may either suppose (with EWALD and others) a prolonged meditation and silence on the part of Shulamith, exhausted by the foregoing lively expression of her longing desire for her lover, or, as intimated in the above translation, that she sinks into a brief slumber, which brings before her in a dream the lover for whom she so ardently longs, and thus in the moment of her awaking recalls to her remembrance a like dream from the early days of her love, which she hereupon relates. No sufficient proof of this assumption can, it is true, be brought from the context. Yet it undoubtedly has more in its favor than, *e. g.*, the hypothesis proposed by UMBREIT, ROCKE, VAIHINGER, RENAN and several of the older writers, that Shulamith utters the words ii. 8-17 in a dream, and then, after awaking, she relates (to the women of the harem around her) a dream which she had previously had, iii. 1 ff., in order to "prove her changeless love to the friend to whom her heart was given." The language in ii. 8-17 has, to be sure, a certain dreamlike vagueness, rather than the character of a strictly historical narration. But this is sufficiently explained by the highly excited fancy of the singer, which brings up the past before her, as though she were experiencing it anew, and which in this lyrical recital, that is any thing but dry narration, here and there springs over what intervenes between the separate particulars of the action, especially in ver. 9 and between vers. 14 and 15.

2. It is, however, far more difficult to determine the scene or the situation, and the external surroundings of the speaker during this act, than to decide upon the form and style of the discourse. The adherents of the shepherd-hypothesis, who here conceive of Shulamith as continuing at Jerusalem in the royal harem, and expressing her longing for her distant lover, can urge, it is true, in favor of this the repetition of the address to the "daughters of Jerusalem" at the close of the section (iii. 5), but are not able to explain why the description in ii. 8-17 presupposes an undoubted country scene, with mountains, hills, vineyards, flowery fields, *etc.*, or why it is a simple monologue of the beloved, and neither Solomon nor the daughters of Jerusalem utter a word. BÖTTCHER's view, therefore, seems to have something in its favor, that the locality of the action was a royal country house not far from Jerusalem, where Shulamith was detained a solitary prisoner. And the one circumstance at least that according to ii. 8 ff. the scene appears to be in the country, might be conveniently combined with the assumption that Shulamith here continues to stay in the royal pleasure-grounds south of the capital, and that Solomon has only left her again for a while for some unknown reasons. But Shulamith's place of abode plainly appears to be one further removed from Jerusalem, and in fact to be located in the region of her home. For 1) the mention of her mother's house, with its wall and its latticed window (iii. 4; ii. 9) makes it probable that she is there. 2) We are also led to the very same result by בְּאַרְצֵנוּ, "in our land," ii. 12, the mention of the "vineyards in bloom," ii. 13, 15, as well as the הָרֵי בָתֶר, ii. 17, whether this difficult expression be rendered "separating mountains," or "cleft mountains," or "spice mountains" (see *in loc.*). 3) Shulamith brought in solemn pomp to the wedding by her royal bridegroom, as described for the first time in the following act, iii. 6-11, presupposes that she had before been staying again in her parents' house; for it is from thence that according to the custom of the ancient Hebrews, the bride must always be brought (comp. 1 Mac. ix. 37, 39; Matth. xxv. 1, *etc.*). 4) That Shulamith came from northern Palestine to Jerusalem for her marriage with Solomon, is also rendered highly probable by the mention of Lebanon in what her newly espoused says to her, iv. 8; and further, the "coming up of the bride out of the wilderness," as described in iii. 6, in her entry into the capital, might point to a coming from the north, and not out of the wilderness of Judah, which lay south of Jerusalem (comp. *in loc.*). Accordingly the parental residence of the bride, or its vicinity is, with DÖPKE, HEILIGSTEDT and DELITZSCH, to be regarded as the scene of this passage—that is to say, Shunem or some neighboring locality in the tribe of Issachar north of Mount Gilboa, or on the south side of "Little Hermon." How Shulamith came thither again from the royal residence, whether peaceably dismissed to her home by agreement with her bridegroom, or conducted thither by himself in order to be subsequently brought with solemn pomp to the wedding, is not clearly explained in the piece. Only every thought must be excluded of a possible flight of the virgin from the royal harem to her home, for she exhibits her longing for her royal lover in undiminished strength, and this too not as though it had arisen from regret at her too hasty flight from him (comp. DELITZSCH, p. 99 f.).—As regards the time of the action, it appears to follow from the way that, ii. 11-13, the winter is described as past, and the fair spring-time as come, that an interval of some months had elapsed between the summer or autumn scene of the preceding act (i. 14, 16 f.; ii. 3 ff.) and the present, or more briefly, that "the entire rainy season lies between ii. 7 and ii. 8" (HITZ.). But as that charming description of opening spring belongs to a narration, and furthermore to a poetic and ideal narration of what Solomon said to his beloved on his first meeting with her, no conclusion can be drawn from it in respect to the time of this action. And neither the "winter" in ii. 11 nor the "nights" in iii. 1 (according to HITZIG the "long winter nights!") afford any support for that opinion, which would charge upon the poet too great a violation of the Aristotelian demand of the unity of time. On the contrary, there is

Digitized by Google

nothing in the way of assuming with **Ewald**, **Böttcher**, **Del.** and most of the later interpreters, an interval of but a few days between Act 1 and 2 (which certainly need not be narrowed down to the space of a few hours, as, *e. g.*, **Vaihinger** assumes), nor of regarding the entire action of the piece generally as taking place in the course of a single spring, and occupying, at the utmost, a few weeks.* Comp. on vii. 13.

3. Ch. ii., vers. 8, 9.

Ver. 8. **Hark! my beloved.**—Literally, "the voice [or sound] of my beloved,"—קוֹל דּוֹדִי, to which abrupt expression הָיָה *it is* or נִשְׁמַע *is heard* is to be supplied as in Isa. xl. 3, 6 (Matt. iii. 3); 2 Kings vi. 32. [It is rather an exclamation, to which no verb need be supplied, see **Green's** *Heb. Chres.* on Isa. xl. 3, 6]. And the following expression, "lo! there he comes," *etc.*, shows that it is not the words of the bridegroom (**Hengstenberg**, after **Michaelis** and many of the older writers), but his coming itself or the sound of his coming and bounding over the mountains and the hills, in short his steps, which are indicated by קוֹל, comp. v. 2; Gen. iii. 8; 1 Kings xiv. 6. That Shulamith was shortly expecting her lover, may be probably inferred from this exclamation of hers which may be supposed to have been occasioned by some noise in which she thought she heard the steps of him for whom she longed. But that which further follows is not a description of his arrival, which now actually ensues (**Magn.**, **Del.**), nor a mere airy fancy sketch or dreaming description of what her friend would say and do, if he were now actually to come (**Umbr.**, **Hitz.**, **Vaih.**, *etc.*—see No. 1, above), but a vivid reminiscence of the way that he had actually come to her the first time and of the loving conversation which had then taken place between him and her by the wall of her parental home. It was the more natural for the bride to be thus vividly transported to the past, as she was hourly expecting her bridegroom back again at the very spot where he had then met with her for the first time.*—**Leaping—bounding** (מְקַפֵּץ—מְדַלֵּג). From this description of her lover's first coming to Shulamith, which is further illustrated by the following figures of the gazelle and the young hart, we may perhaps conclude that Solomon while hunting on Mount Gilboa, or in its vicinity, saw his beloved there for the first time, and formed a connection with her in the manner ideally described in what follows.

Ver. 9. **My beloved is like a gazelle or a young hart.** **Hitzig** calls in question the genuineness of these words, with no other grounds of suspicion than such as are purely subjective. They are designed more particularly to illustrate and justify in their application to her lover the somewhat bold and in themselves not very intelligible terms דלג "leaping," and קפץ "bounding." And this they manifestly do in so far as they call attention to the fact that he resembles those fair and noble animals not in his speed and agility merely, but generally in the charming grace and loftiness of his whole bearing. Comp. passages like 2 Sam. ii. 18; 1 Chron. xii. 8; Prov. vi. 5, where speed alone is the *tert. comp.* in this figure, with Ps. xviii. 34; Hab. iii. 19; Prov. v. 19, where the other qualities of these animals are also taken into the account.—**Lo here he is, standing behind our wall.** Judged by the analogy of other passages, in which it is found, the word here used does not mean the wall about the vineyard but the wall of the house, to which the mention of the window immediately after also points.† "Our wall," because Shulamith means the house belonging to her family, in or near which she now is again [or which she so well remembers —Tr.]; comp. viii. 8 "our sister," and "our vineyards" ver. 15.—**Looking through the windows, glancing through the lattices**—literally, "from the windows, from the lattices." It is a matter of indifference from which window he looks into the interior; it was only worth while to affirm in the general that he looked in from the region of the windows, that is from without. "Window" (חַלּוֹן), and "lattice" (חֲרַכָּא—according to the Targ. Josh. ii. 15, 18

* [If Shulamith is here describing her first meeting with her royal lover, there is no reason why she might not remember and relate it as fully as is here done, without the necessity of being transported for the purpose from Jerusalem to Shunem, even supposing that to have been her original home. Especially as her adjuration of the "daughters of Jerusalem," iii. 5, is a more evident proof of her still being in the royal capital, than any which **Zöckler** has been able to bring to the contrary. He seems to have made the mistake of confounding the locality of a past event narrated with the place of the narrator. It may be a necessity to the dramatic hypothesis to get her back again to Shunem, after her residence with the king in his palace, in order that she may come thence in solemn pomp to her marriage at a subsequent period. But this scarcely warrants the drawing of so large a conclusion from so slender a premise.

The advocates of the idyllic hypothesis find here a distinct song, describing a visit paid by the lover to the fair object of his affections, without being at any pains to trace a connection between it and what had preceded. **Taylor** thinks that this belongs to the second day of the marriage feast; the bride from her window in the palace is attracted by the sound of a hunting party (ii. 15); the bridegroom, who is one of the party, looks up and addresses her. **Withington** supposes some time to have elapsed since the preceding scene. "The bride had gone up to Jerusalem, and after a stay there had gone back to the country, and was to remain there until the season came of her husband's rustication, which would naturally be in the spring." **Burrowes**: "The beloved had left the spouse; these words describe his return." **Wordsworth** connects this scene directly with the immediately preceding verse, the slumber of the bridegroom there described being equivalent to his absence or withdrawal: "The patience of the bride, after long waiting, is rewarded by the joyful sight of the bridegroom bounding over the hills." **Ginsburg**, with his peculiar modification of the shepherd-hypothesis, describes the situation as follows: "The Shulamite, to account for the severity of her brothers, mentioned in ii. 6, relates that her beloved shepherd came one charming morning in the spring to invite her to the fields (8–14); that her brothers, in order to prevent her from going, gave her employment in the gardens (15); that she consoled herself with the assurance that her beloved, though separated from her at that time, would come again in the evening (16, 17); that seeing he did not come, she, under difficult circumstances, ventured to seek him and found him (iii. 1–4)."—Tr.]

* [There is no propriety in sundering this from what follows. The succeeding verses evidently continue or explain this opening exclamation. If it belongs to the present, so does the entire description which it introduces. If the coming of the beloved here narrated is past, her exclamation on hearing the sound of his approach is past also.—Tr.]

† [**Harmer** supposes the reference is to a kiosk or eastern arbor, and quotes the Letters of Lady Montague, who speaks of them II. p. 74 as "enclosed with gilded lattices, round which vines, jessamines and honeysuckles make a sort of green wall."]

Digitized by Google

equivalent to חַלּוֹן, of the same meaning also with אֶשְׁנָב Judg. v. 28; Prov. vii. 6, as well as with אֲרֻבָּה Hos. xiii. 3; Eccles. xii. 3) are plainly only different names for the same thing, of which however the latter expression is the more special or precise; for the lattice properly closed the aperture of the window and consequently was that through which he must have looked, comp. 2 Kin. xiii. 17.—מֵצִיץ literally, "blooming" (comp. Isa. xxvii. 6; Ps. cxxxii. 18 and especially Ps. lxxii. 16, where מֵצִיץ occurs of men blooming out of the earth) does not express a "transient appearing" or a "quick and stolen glance," but evidently describes the blooming and radiant appearance of her lover, who is also called "white and red," v. 10. "He blooms in through the window" (comp. MICHAELIS: "*roseum suum vultum instar floris jucundissimi per retia cancellorum ostendens*") is a pregnant expression, and reminds one of Gen. xlix. 22, where Joseph is described as a young fruit tree of luxuriant growth, whose "daughters" run over the wall.*

4. SOLOMON'S FIRST GREETING TO SHULAMITH, vers. 10–14.

Ver. 10. **My beloved answered and said to me.** In opposition to the doubts of MAGNUS and DELITZSCH regarding the genuineness of these words, see above No. 1. In respect to עָנָה in the opening of a discourse and consequently in the sense of "beginning to speak" (not "answering" HENGSTENBERG), comp. Deut. xxi. 7; xxvi. 5; 2 Chron. xxix. 31; Isa. xiv. 10; Job iii. 2, and ἀποκρίνεσθαι, which is frequently so used in the New Testament.† **Arise, my dear, my fair one, and go forth**, *viz.*, out of the house—not "out of the city into the country," as the adherents of the shepherd-hypothesis suppose, who think the shepherd utters these words to Shulamith in her captive condition (similarly also WEISSBACH).‡

Ver. 11. **For lo, the winter is past.** סְתָו (for which the K'ri סְתָיו to fix the correct pronunciation instead of סְתוֹ as it might possibly be read) denotes, as also in Aram., the winter and that on the side of its cold, as the parallel expression גֶּשֶׁם (comp. Eccles. xii. 2; Job xxxvii. 6) denotes the same on the side of its moisture, that is to say, as the rainy season (עֵת גְּשָׁמִים *time of rain*, Ezr. x. 9, 13). The winter as the cold season of the year necessarily keeps people in the house; whence the allusion to its being past adds force to the solicitation to come out of the house.

Ver. 12. **The flowers appear in the land,** literally, "are seen (נִרְאוּ) in the land." On the rapidity with which the spring with its new verdure and its blooming attire usually follows the winter in the East, comp. HASSELQUIST, *Reisen*, p. 261.—**The time of singing has arrived.** עֵת הַזָּמִיר is not the "time for pruning vines," as the old translators explained it, after the analogy of Lev. xxv. 3 f.; Isa. v. 6; for in vers. 13 and 15 the vines are represented as already in blossom, the time for pruning them was therefore long since past; but it is the "time of singing, of merry songs." By this, however, we are not to understand the singing of birds (IBN EZRA, RASHI, E. MEIER), but conformably to Isa. xxv. 5 (זָמִיר), xxiv. 16; Job xxxv. 10; Ps. cxix. 54; 2 Sam. xxiii. 1, *etc.* (זְמִירוֹת), the glad songs of men, such as spring usually awakens, especially in the life of shepherds and country people (comp. Judg. xxi. 20 f.).—**And the voice of the turtle is heard in our land**, *viz.* in Palestine, the land of Solomon and and Shulamith. This בְּאַרְצֵנוּ does not by any means require us to regard Shulamith's country lover as the speaker, although it favors the assumption that the scene of the narrative lay in the country rather than in the city. The "turtle-dove" (תּוֹר) as a bird of passage (Jer. viii. 7) is a fit representative of spring, and it need not therefore symbolize the Holy Spirit (TARG.), nor the meek (HENGSTENB.), nor Israel in general (HAHN).

Ver. 13. **The fig tree spices its fruit.** As פַּגִּים means not the early figs but the late figs, *i. e.* the small fruit of the fig tree which continues to grow during the winter, and does not ripen until spring (Septuag. ὄλυνθοι, Vulgate, *grossi*), and as חָנַט signifies, Gen. l. 2, 26, "to spice, to perfume," this verb must here too have the sense of spicing and denote that "aromatic sweetness" which figs attain about the time of their ripening (comp. SCHUBERT, *Reise* III. p. 113). We must reject, therefore, both the "putting forth" of the ancient versions (Sept., Aq., Vulg., Syr.), and the signification of "reddening" or "browning," preferred by EWALD, HITZIG, RENAN, *etc.*; for the late figs are of a violet color even during the winter, when they are still unfit to eat (comp. MEIER and WEISSBACH *in loc.*).—**And the vines are in blossom**, literally, "are blossom." סְמָדַר a substantive, which occurs again ver. 15 and vii. 13, and whose etymology is very obscure (comp. VELTH., EWALD and HITZIG *in loc.*), can mean nothing but "blossom, vine blossom" either here or in the other two passages; and this is confirmed by the ancient versions (SEPT. κυπρίζειν, VULG. *florere*, SYMM. οἰνάνθη; also the SYR. on Isa. xvii. 11). It plainly makes no difference in the sense whether we translate "the vines are blossom (comp. *e. g.* Ex. ix. 31), give fragrance" (as is commonly done) or "the vines in blossom, *i. e.* since they are blossoming, yield their fragrance" (see *e. g.* WEISSB. comp. DELITZSCH). With regard to the fine delicious fragrance of the vine blossom comp. also Ecclus. xxiv. 23.

Ver. 14. **My dove in the clefts of the rock.**—No pause is observable between vers. 13 and 14 (HITZIG; comp. WEISSBACH). The tenderly caressing and alluring language continues without change. Solomon here entitles his beloved a "dove in the clefts of the rock," because, as appears from ver. 9, the bars of the latticed window still separate him from her. The allu-

* [WORDSW.: Literally, *sprouting* and *blooming* like a flowering shrub or creeper, whose blossoms peep and glance through the trellis or lattice work of a window, and giving brightness and loveliness to the apartment.]

† [WORDSW.: Here is an anticipation of the phrase so often applied in the gospels to Christ, who answered even the thoughts of His hearers.]

‡ [It can scarcely be anything but a slip when WITHINGTON puts these words into the mouth of the bride: "He hears her distant voice: Rise up, my love," *etc.*—TR.]

Digitized by Google

sion to her dove-like innocence and her lovely form is altogether subordinate, but must nevertheless not be left wholly out of the account as *e. g.* WEISSBACH insists; for "dove" is undoubtedly a tender pet-name, comp. vi. 9, and even i. 15. The allegorical interpretation, which sees in the dove "persecuted innocence" (HENGSTEN.), or even the righteous hiding himself in the gaping wounds of Christ (THEODORET, GREG. THE GREAT, J. GERH.) has clearly no exegetical justification.* **In the secret of the cliffs,** literally "in the hiding-place of the ladder of rock, of the steep rocky precipices," for this appears to be the meaning of the word here used. The expression evidently serves only to finish out the figure employed immediately before of the clefts of the rock concealing the dove. No conclusion can be based upon it respecting Shulamith's place of residence, as though it actually were a rock-bound castle (BÖTTCHER), or were in Solomon's lofty palace upon Zion (EWALD, HITZIG, VAIH., *etc.*)† The present description would rather appear to indicate (comp. above No. 2) that Shulamith's country home was surrounded by a mountainous and rocky region (DELITZSCH).—**Let me see thy form,** מַרְאֶה denotes in this poem not barely the face (this Solomon already saw through the lattice) but the entire form, comp. v. 15, also Gen. xii. 11;. xxix. 17; xxxix. 6.—**Let me hear thy voice.** Evidently an invitation to sing, with which Shulamith complies in ver. 15.—The following fortifying clause reminds of the similar one in ver. 9, *a.*

5. SHULAMITH'S ANSWER.

Ver. 15. That this verse is a little vintagers' song or at least the fragment of one, and that Shulamith sings it in answer to the request of her lover in vers. 10–14 is regarded as settled by most of the recent interpreters since HERDER. Only the allegorists, as HENGSTENBERG, HAHN, *etc.* see expressed in it Shulamith's fear of the foes of God's vineyard (*i. e.* heretics according to HENGSTENBERG, [so COV., PATR., POOLE and the generality of English Commentators], pagan Hamites according to HAHN.); and EWALD inappropriately puts the words into the mouth of the lover, who thus makes the connection again with what he had said in ver. 13. That we rather have here a separate ditty or fragment of a song, is shown not only by the plural form of address, but also by the accumulation of rhymes (שׁעלים, כרמים, מחבלים, קטנים). And that this ditty is sung by the bride, not by the bridegroom, appears from its contents, which seem perfectly suitable for the keeper of a vineyard (see 1. 6), but not for her lover, be he king or shepherd.* It is, however, arbitrary and preposterous to assume with HITZIG and RENAN, that Shulamith sings this sonnet at one of the windows in the harem at Jerusalem in order to inform her lover from her old home, who was in the vicinity of the place of her abode, in nearly the same way that Richard Cœur de Lion betrayed the place of his captivity to Blondel, his faithful minstrel, by singing the refrain of a song familiar to them both. The whole situation too is not in the remotest manner adapted to such a romantic and sentimental meaning and design of the sonnet. Its context rather indicates plainly enough that it still belongs to Shulamith's narrative of her first meeting with her lover, and consequently is neither more nor less than her answer to his request to come out to him and to sing to him,—an answer, which whether actually given by her in just these words or not, at all events concealed a delicate allusion to her lover under a popular veil artlessly employed and half in jest, and intimated to him that she was not disinclined to let him take part henceforth in her care for the security of her vineyard. If she really sang these words, she did so while opening the doors of her house to admit her lover who stood without before the wall, or while she stepped out to him singing and smiling (comp. DELITZSCH *in loc.*)—**Catch us foxes, little foxes, spoiling vineyards.** The foxes deserve this name, not because they attack the ripe grapes themselves (THEOCR. *Id.* I. 46, ff; V. 112), but because by their passages and holes they undermine the walls of the vineyards and injure the roots of the vines; and they also gnaw the stems and young shoots.† It was important, therefore, in the spring when the vines were blossoming, to protect the vineyards from these uninvited guests; and the more so, since the spring is the very time of the coming forth of the young foxes from their kennels. The predicate קְטַנִּים *little* refers to *young* foxes (comp. Gen. ix. 24; xxvii. 15; 1 Kin. iii. 7), not to the diminutive size of the animals which nevertheless do so much damage [so HARMER, GOOD, WILLIAMS]; in that case the smaller variety of the jackal, which is known by the name of *adive*, would be specially intended by שֻׁעָלִים (HITZIG). But as the jackal is always called אִי or תַּן (Job xxx. 29. Mic. i. 8) in every other passage in which it is mentioned in the Old Testament, whilst שׁוּעָל

* HARMER says, on the authority of DR. SHAW: "Doves in those countries, it seems, take up their abodes in the hollow places of rocks and cliffs." WORDSW. suggests that the comparison is "to a dove fleeing to the clefts of the rock for refuge from the storm." GOOD quotes as parallel the following simile from HOMER's description of the wounded Diana, *Il.* xxi. 493.

"As when the falcon wings her way above,
To the cleft cavern speeds the affrighted dove,
Straight to her shelter thus the goddess flew."]

† [So HARMER, who supposes an allusion to "her apartments in a lofty palace of stone." GOOD: "The common version, 'secret places of the stairs' is erroneous. The mistake has obviously originated from a wish in the translators to give a literal interpretation to this highly figurative phraseology. Stairs may well enough apply to the royal fair-one as a bride, but not as a dove."]

* [GOOD, BURROWES, NOYES, ADELAIDE NEWTON, WITHINGTON, THRUPP, make this the language of the bride; PATRICK, POOLE, AINSWORTH, HENRY, SCOTT, TAYLOR, FRY, CLARKE, WORDSWORTH the language of the bridegroom. GINSBURG puts it in the mouth of Shulamith's brothers. WILLIAMS is led by the plural form of the pronouns both of the first and second persons to suppose that the chorus of virgins is here addressing the companions of the bridegroom. The ingenious suggestion that these words may be borrowed from a popular song, which here receive a new meaning from their connection, agrees well with this peculiarity in the form of expression and also with the intimation in the preceding verse.

WORDSW.: "He commands her to look well to her vineyard. He calls it *our* vineyard; it is his as well as hers." WITHINGTON, (after TAYLOR, who thinks this verse a summons to a chase) sees in it an allusion to the "sports and employments of the care-worn king" in his seasons of relaxation.]

† [PATRICK: ARISTOPHANES in his *Equites*, compares soldiers to foxes; spoiling whole countries as they do vineyards.]

Digitized by Google

is the constant designation of the fox proper, we are not justified here in departing from this usual meaning of the expression, comp. OEDMANN, *Sammlungen* II. 38; WINER, *Real-Wörterbuch*, Art. *Füchse*, also P. CASSEL on Judg. xv. 4. Moreover the expressions "little foxes" and "destroying vineyards" are simply related as in apposition to the principal object שֻׁעָלִים; and both this and the words named as in apposition are without the article, because it is not *the* foxes universally, but just foxes, vineyard-destroying foxes that are to be taken. HITZIG seeks without necessity to base upon this absence of the article before שֻׁעָלִים his translation "hold for us, ye foxes," *etc.*, which he makes equivalent to "wait, ye foxes, I'll give it to you!"—**For our vineyards are in bloom**, literally "and our vineyards are in bloom;" comp. in respect to this specifying "and, and in fact," which here has a specially motive character, Eccles. i. 15; viii. 2; Judg. vi. 25; vii. 22; Mal. i. 11, and in general EWALD, § 340, *b*. By the expression סְמָדַר the singer takes up again what had been said by her lover, ver. 13, *a*, whether she altered her ditty in conformity with it, or that expression in the mouth of Solomon recalled to her mind this vernal song with the like-sounding refrain; this latter view is evidently the more natural.

6. CONCLUSION OF THE FIRST MONOLOGUE. Vers. 16, 17.

Ver. 16. **My beloved is mine and I am his.**—This declaration that she has become the property of her beloved and he hers, that they have mutually surrendered themselves to one another (comp. vi. 3; vii. 11), does not continue Shulamith's answer to the greeting of Solomon, ver. 10 *b*-14 (DELITZSCH, WEISSBACH, *etc.*), but after her account of her first meeting with him, which terminates with ver. 15, she takes up again the expression of her desire for her absent lover uttered in vers. 8, 9, by asserting in the first instance that though still absent, he was inseparably bound to her.*—**Who feeds among the lilies.**—Manifestly a figurative expression for "who, wherever he abides, spreads radiance, joy and loveliness about him," or "in whose footsteps roses and lilies ever bloom."† With reference to the figurative nature of this form of speech as a fixed and favorite poetical phrase, comp. its recurrence with two different applications, iv. 5 and vi. 3. Shulamith had already represented her royal lover as feeding his flock, i. 7.

Ver. 17. **Against the day cools and the shadows flee.**—Contrary to the division of the verses, as well as to the analogy of vi. 3, HERDER, AMM., KLEUKER, DÖPKE [so COVERDALE, DOWAY] connect these words with the participial clause at the close of the preceding verse. "Feeding among the lilies till the day grows cool" would yield a very tame and trivial thought, whilst, on the other hand, the following solicitation, "turn thee," *etc.*, can scarcely dispense with some more particular statement of the time up to which or about which it should be complied with. Upon עַד שֶׁ (literally, "enduring till," "waiting till")="until," "whilst," by the time that, comp. the like forms of expression, Gen. xxiv. 33; xxvii. 45; Ex. xxii. 26; 1 Sam. i. 22; xiv. 19, *etc.*; also i. 12 above, where, it is true, the connection demands a somewhat different translation. Shulamith evidently begs her lover to return to her before the coming on of the shades of evening (before the day wholly cools, and the ever lengthening shadows melt quite away in the darkness—comp. Job xiv. 2). By evening, at the latest, and before night, he should come over the mountains to her swift as a gazelle, as at that first time when she had seen him bounding over the summits and the hills (ver. 8).*—**Turn thee and be like,** *etc.*—סֹב neither qualifies דְּמֵה adverbially, "resemble hereabouts a gazelle," *etc.* (WEISSBACH); nor is it an invitation to her friend already present to ramble with her upon the mountains in the neighborhood" (DELITZSCH); nor equivalent to "turn back again," as though it were intended to call back one who had shortly before been near her and who was going away (BÖTTCHER); but simply="turn thyself hither, direct thy steps hither" (comp. 1 Sam. xxii. 18; 2 Sam. xviii. 30). The Vulgate quite correctly, therefore, as regards the sense, *revertere;* so also the SYR., LUTH., *etc.*—The call upon him to "resemble the gazelle" is evidently connected with the description given of her lover in ver. 8. She wishes that her lover would now soon return, as she saw him then, swiftly and gracefully, like the sudden appearing of a noble deer on the mountain height.—**On cleft mountains.**—This translation of the difficult עַל־הָרֵי בָתֶר is especially favored by the ἐπὶ ὄρη κοιλωμάτων of the Sept. The usual signification of בֶּתֶר, "piece," "severed portion" (Gen. xv. 10; Jer. xxxiv. 18, 19, *etc.*) lies at the basis of it; and both the name of the place, בִּתְרוֹן, Bithron, the designation of a mountain ravine east of the Jordan, 2 Sam. ii. 29, and the Greek

* [WILLIAMS: "These verses stand perfectly distinct from the preceding." Others endeavor to establish a direct connection with the foregoing verses. Thus TAYLOR paraphrases: "I am all obedience to his requests; it shall be my happiness to accomplish his desires." And WORDSWORTH in its spiritual application: "The Church thankfully catches up the expression 'our vineyard;' and rejoices that not only have they one vineyard, but that He is hers and she is His."]

† [GOOD, with an entire misapprehension of the figure intended: "So sweet is his breath, that surely he feedeth among the lilies." GINSB.: "Who tends his flock in the meadows abounding with flowers." A figure for "the best pastures," according to WILLIAMS, "for in such lilies appear to have grown spontaneously;" or for "sweet and lovely pastures," according to POOLE, "where there is not only herbage to feed them, but lilies to delight them." FRY suggests as the connection between the clauses of the verse: "let him drive his flock to pasture in the flowery meads and I will accompany him." AINSWORTH, HENRY, WORDS. and others find in the lilies a figurative reference to the bride herself as the object of his fond attachment, and one who had been compared to a lily among thorns, ii. 2.]

* [GOOD: "Till the day breathe. The expression is truly elegant and poetical. At midnight all nature lies dead and lifeless. The shadows, however, at length fly; the morning breathes and nature revivifies. The intrinsic excellence of the metaphor has seldom been understood by our commentators, who have almost all of them referred it to the day breeze of the country, or at least to that peculiar current of air which is often found existing in most climates at the dawn." WILLIAMS: "Return, my beloved, and remain with me until the day breathe." NOYES: "This is understood by many of the morning. But the more recent commentators refer it to sunset or the evening." WORDSW.: "Before the first cool gales of the evening."]

Digitized by Google

ῥαγάς, "fissure, cleft," offer themselves at once as confirmatory analogies (comp. GESEN., *Lex.*, also VAIH., RENAN and DELITZSCH *in loc.*, "riven mountains"). Commonly, "on mountains of separation," *i. e.*, on the mountains that separate us (comp. LUTHER, "*auf den Scheidebergen;*" MERC., EWALD, HITZIG, also the TARG., IBN EZRA and JARCHI) [so GINSBURG]. Peculiarly WEISSBACH "on the spice-mountains" (or "Bathrum heights," comp. Vulg., "*super montes Bother,*" and THEODORET, who, as well as the Syr., translates similarly "ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη θυμιαμάτων"); by this he supposes to be meant Shulamith's breasts perfumed with aromatic betel-leaves, *i. e.*, with μαλοβάθρον, *malabathrum*=Syr., *bathrum.* But such an adducing of the הָרֵי בְשָׂמִים, *mountains of spices* mentioned in viii. 14, and that as identical in signification with the "mountain of myrrh" and "hill of frankincense" mentioned in iv. 6, *i. e.*, with the fragrant breasts of his beloved (?), is in the present instance manifestly destructive of the sense and repugnant to the connection, and would besides yield an absolutely lascivious sense, which the expressions in question do not have in the two passages alleged.

7. SHULAMITH'S DREAM WITH THE EPIPHONEMA TO THE DAUGHTERS OF JERUSALEM, iii. 1-5.—Comp. above No. 1 and 2. This brief section, the narration of a dream which she had previously had, need not be referred to any other place than that of the preceding action; and no convincing ground can be gathered from the passage itself, either for the view of DELITZSCH that from the scene of the present action "Jerusalem was visible in the distance," nor for that of WEISSBACH, who imagines the scene to have been the very streets of Jerusalem. The adjuration of the daughters of Jerusalem at the close by no means implies their presence, but is sufficiently explained by the fact that the speaker, led by the same feelings as before (ii. 5 ff.) to a lively expression of the harm resulting from a self-induced exciting of the love sickness, clothes this expression in exactly the same words now as then, and conceives of the same witnesses present here as there. As besides the exclamation in question has also the character of a general moral sentiment (comp. above p. 55) intended for the spectators (real or imaginary) of the piece, the address to the women of Jerusalem conceived of as really distant from the speaker, would be the less surprising. And further, in the third passage, in which the exclamation occurs, viii. 4, the absence of the persons addressed is more probable than their presence (see *in loc.*).

Ver. 1. **On my bed in the nights**—*i. e.*, agreeably to the context and the whole situation the same as "once in a dream," "lying upon my bed by night and dreaming."* בַּלֵּילוֹת belongs not to the verb "I sought," but to the preceding, "on my bed" (comp. the like connection in ii. 8); and this entire statement of the place and time "on my nightly couch," is plainly not designed to declare where she had vainly sought her lover, *viz.*, in her bed (LUTHER, so too HENGSTENBERG, DELITZSCH, WEISSBACH), but how she had sought and not found him, *viz.*, sleeping and dreaming at night. DELITZSCH, *e. g.*, has sought to set aside what is morally offensive in the former explanation, by the assertion that "in a dream she might miss her lover even in the night, as though he were already her husband, who shared her bed." But thus it is clear that the offence is not removed; it is only increased. Far more attractively, and answering more exactly to the true construction, HITZIG: "It would be inadmissible to understand it: I thought to find him on my bed. Rather: I on my bed thought to find him. And not him too on the bed. She afterwards in ver. 2 resolves to seek him out of the house; so she seeks him now in the room, inside of the house, as far as her eye can penetrate, not barely within her bodily reach." Moreover, "in the nights" is certainly not equivalent to "in long and dreary nights" (HENGSTENB., and in general almost all the allegorists), nor "in the long winter nights" (HITZIG), nor "in several nights," as though the same dream had been repeated more than once (VAIHINGER) [WESTMINST. ANNOTAT.: "night after night;" so PATRICK]; but the plur. stands poetically for the sing. as more general and pictorial [GREEN'S *Heb. Chrest.* on Gen. xxxvii. 8]; comp. the "clefts of the rock" and "steeps," ii. 14 and בַּלֵּילוֹת again, ver. 8.—**I sought him whom my soul loves.** Comp. on i. 7.—**I sought him and I found him not**—*viz.*, in my immediate surroundings, which my dream had in the first instance conjured up before me.

Ver. 2. **I will rise now and go about in the city.** With life-like vividness of description she relates what she said in her dream, as though she were saying it now for the first time. It is therefore unnecessary to supply אָמַרְתִּי *I said* (comp. vii. 9) before אָקוּמָה נָּא. The city with its markets and streets, where she proposes to wander about seeking her lover, is certainly Jerusalem, the royal city itself. She was there when she had the dream, and the action of the dream accordingly takes place there too.—**In the markets and in the streets.** The impropriety that there would be in an Israelitish maiden's actually roving about the streets in such a search (comp. Prov. vii. 11) disappears of course, if Shulamith was dreaming.

Ver. 3. **Found me the watchmen who go about in the city.** Such nightly guardians

* [So GOOD: "The word 'dream' does not occur in the original; but from the period of time, the place and position of the fair bride, there can be no doubt that she is here describing a dream." SCOTT: "The circumstances of this narration (and of one in some respects similar in the fifth chapter) are so improbable, if applied in their literal meaning to the newly-espoused queen of King Solomon, that to avoid the difficulty and to maintain the consistency of a dramatic poem on occasion of Solomon's marriage, it has been considered merely as a dream of the spouse. But the narrative gives not the least intimation of this." To which, however, NOYES replies: "The author would not be more likely to violate probability or propriety in an allegory than in the ordinary products of his imagination." WITH.: "She imagines herself in the city, and relates the incidents in vers. 3, 4. There is no need of supposing it a dream; it may be accounted for by the vivacity of eastern thought." TAYLOR thinks that what is subsequently said of the nocturnal search is not descriptive of what the bride actually did, but optative or hypothetical. FRY springs over the difficulty by means of his idyllic hypothesis, conceiving that this has no relation to the "nuptials of King Solomon," but that it relates "a circumstance in domestic life, among the lower or middling classes of society"].

Digitized by Google

of the public safety might easily occur to the simple country maiden in her dream, because she had heard of their existence, or also because she had seen some of them at night from her residence. Comp. Ps. cxxvii. 1; Isa. lii. 8.—**Whom my soul loves, have ye seen?** The emotion of the questioner led to the prefixing of the object "whom my soul loves," as the word of greatest consequence to her.*

Ver. 4. **Scarcely had I passed from them;** literally "what I had passed from them was a little, until I found," *etc.* (So correctly Hitzig, Weissbach).—**When I found him whom my soul loves.** Not because she thought herself at once transported from the city to her home (Hitzig), but simply in virtue of the easily shifting and quickly changing scenery of dreams, which bring now this person, now that immediately before us.—**I grasped him and did not let him go.** So also Delitzsch, Hitzig, *etc.*, after the Sept. *Cod. Vatic.* (Καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκα αὐτόν), the Syr. and Rashi. On the contrary, the Vulg. "*tenui eum, nec dimittam,*" and similarly Vatabl., Ewald, Hengstb., Weissb., *etc.* [So Cov., Doway: will not let him go]. But וְלֹא אַרְפֶּנּוּ by no means compels us to regard the action as future, "for the connection with Vav relat. [conversive] was simply severed by the negative and the second mode [future] was allowed to remain, comp. Job xxiii. 11; Jer. xliv. 42; 2 Sam. ii. 28, Ewald, *Lehrb.* § 333 *c.*" (Hitzig). The immediate linking too of אֲחַזְתִּיו with מְצָאתִי, as well as the circumstance that the language does not pass into the form of an address to her lover ("I grasp thee and will not let thee go," *etc.*), shows plainly enough that Shulamith is continuing her account of what occurred in her dream.† **Until I had brought him into my mother's house.** The house or tent of the mother is, in the East, the proper residence of the female members of the family, comp. Gen. xxiv. 67; Ruth i. 8. In the mouth of Shulamith the expression properly vouches only for her childlike, artless and dutiful disposition (comp. Introduc. § 4, Rem. i.), not for the specially chaste and pure character of her love for Solomon (Delitzsch), and still less certainly for any impure lusts that she might cherish (Weissbach). And there is no intimation of the latter in the words added, simply for the sake of the parallelism, "and into the chamber of her that conceived me."‡

Ver. 5. Comp. on ii. 7, as well as above, at the beginning of this No.

* [Poole: She accosted the watchmen "without either fear or shame, as being transported and wholly swallowed up with love. She doth not name him [her husband] because she thought it needless, as supposing that a person of such transcendent excellency could not be unknown to men in that public capacity. Their answer is not mentioned, either because they gave her no answer, at least no satisfactory answer, or because by their silence she gathered that they were unable or unwilling to inform her; and being eager in the pursuit of her beloved, she would not lose time in impertinent discourses with them"].

† [The second verb is certainly future, though the act described may still be past, its time being reckoned not from the moment of speaking, but from the period denoted by the antecedent verb. The future, when thus employed, indicates that the act is subsequent to or conditioned by the preceding preterite. Green's *Heb. Gram.*, § 263, 5 *a*. The shade of thought so suggested is well expressed in the English Version: "I held him, and *would not let him go.*"—Tr.]

‡ [Hodgson: "This passage seems to prove that the person here married was not Pharaoh's daughter; for if she had been Pharaoh's daughter, her mother's house would have been in Egypt, whereas this scene lies in Jerusalem; for in the next line she addresses the daughters of Jerusalem, and desires them not to disturb her sleeping husband"].

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. According to the allegorical exegesis of ancient as of modern times, the essential thing described in this song is the "painful search," which must precede the finding of the heavenly bridegroom on the part of his church, as well as on the part of the soul of the individual believer. And they commonly find in ii. 8–17 the development of the thought "that sore trials will precede the appearing of the heavenly Solomon," while iii. 1–5 sets forth the truth that the salvation of the Messiah cannot be brought to pass by one's own strength, nor by earthly and human means, but that whoever seeks to draw the Saviour down from heaven in this way, not only will not find Him, but will be found and punished by His watchmen. In short, the native inability of man to achieve his salvation of himself, and the necessity of a saving interposition of divine grace from above to deliver us from our distress and disquiet, is thought to form the principal object represented in this section (comp. Hengstenberg, pp. 49–66; Hahn, p. 46; Starke, *Synops.*, p. 2404, 2426 f., and the older interpreters there adduced).*

* [Doway, note on ii. 8: "The voice of my beloved: that is, the preaching of the gospel surmounting difficulties." On ii. 15: "Christ commands His pastors to catch false teachers, by holding forth their fallacy and erroneous doctrine, which, like foxes, would bite and destroy the vines." On iii. 1: "The Gentiles as in the dark, and seeking in heathen delusion what they could not find, the true God, until Christ revealed His doctrine to them by His watchmen (ver. 3), that is, by the apostles and teachers, by whom they were converted to the true faith. And holding that faith firmly, the spouse, the Catholic church declares (ver. 4), that 'She will not let Him go, till she bring Him into her mother's house,' that is, till at last the Jews shall also find him."

Geneva, note on ii. 8: "This is spoken of Christ, who took upon Him our nature to come to help His Church." On ver. 15: "Suppress the heretics while they are young, that is, when they begin to destroy the vine of the Lord." On iii. 1: "The Church in troubles seeketh to Christ, but is not incontinently heard."

Wordsw., on ii. 8: "After absence the bridegroom returns. The Church is comforted after her trials. Thus it was at the first advent, when Christ came to the Church after long expectation; and thus will it be when He will come at the great day." On ver. 15: "The duty of the Church to maintain the faith and to repress heresy. The poisonous error is to be nipped in the bud." On iii. 1: "The Bride seeming to herself to be left a widow, seeks her Beloved in a time of darkness and sorrow, and she finds Him not; she therefore goes forth in quest of Him. This has been verified at divers times in the history of the Church, specially was it true at the time of our Lord's passion. So will it be in the dark night of Anti-Christianism, on the eve of the second advent of Christ." On ver. 4: "The Church passes from the watchmen, because they would not help her to find Christ. This is a very important text, in reference to the question of schism. If the watchmen of a church do not direct the eyes of the faithful to Christ, the faithful must pass from them—whatever the consequences may be—the faithful must seek for Christ until they find Him."

According to Thrupp, this section describes the Church as patiently awaiting the advent through a long season of dark storms, of baneful attacks and of anxious searchings. Moody Stuart makes its subject to be "the sleeping Bride awakened;" first, "the call to meet the bridegroom" through "the preaching of John the Baptist," ii. 8–15; secondly, "the response to the call," ii. 16—iii. 5, when "John's disciples seek Christ." Weiss. finds the winter (ii. 11) in the forty years' wandering of the children of Israel in the desert: the foxes (ver. 15) are the idolatrous Canaanites whom they were bidden to destroy; the night (iii. 1) is the period of the Judges, marked by few revelations; the watchmen (ver. 3)

Digitized by Google

2. A considerate historical exposition also recognizes the loving desire and search of a bride for her bridegroom, as the main object described in this act. But it avoids seeing anything morally reprehensible in this longing desire of the maiden separated from her lover. It rather, in accordance with the unmistakable design of the poet, regards this very fidelity with which the bride clings to the friend of her choice even during a long separation, as one of the loveliest traits in her character. Neither by day nor by night, neither waking nor dreaming can she turn her thoughts away from the object of her affection.* Every noise seems to her to betoken his coming; in the sound of every voice she fancies that she hears him for whom she ardently longs, and whom she is expecting back with painful eagerness. With perfect distinctness and the utmost vividness the glad event of her first meeting with her lover still stands before her eyes. She recalls most clearly all the particulars of an occurrence, the most enrapturing she has ever known. Of the sweet and flattering words, which her royal bridegroom then addressed to her, not one has escaped her. She can still relate most exactly both the words perfumed with the sweetest fragrance of spring, with which her nature-loving, nature-appreciating friend then enticed her out and irresistibly drew her to himself, and the verse of the rustic song, by singing which she playfully gave him to understand that she returned his affection, that her vineyard should henceforth bloom for him, and that he should help her to guard and keep it. And that other painful and yet blessed moment of her former intercourse with her royal lover stands no less clearly before her eyes, which taught her, in a dream it is true, and yet with heart-stirring power, that she could no longer live without him, that she could not be for an instant separated from him without experiencing a painful longing for him, and that this loving desire and languishing for him would never henceforth cease until she had him and held him, until she was wholly and forever united with him. This yearning of her heart, so affectingly described by her, attains its acme once in the conclusion which she reaches in her account of her first interview with her lover (ii. 16): "My beloved is mine, and I am his, who feeds among the lilies;" and again, in the closing words of her recital of her dream (iii. 4): "I grasped him and did not let him go until I had brought him into my mother's house and into the chamber of her that conceived me."

are Samuel and the prophets of his school; following their directions Israel soon found his Lord in the days of David (ver. 4). BURROWES: In ii. 8–17, our Lord allures us by the beauty of heaven; iii. 1–5 describes a "season of spiritual desertion," differing from v. 2–8, "in this respect that in the latter the beloved is repulsed by neglect, while in the former nothing of that kind seems mentioned." PATRICK remarks upon the words "on my bed," iii. 1: "This is expounded with strange variety by interpreters; some understanding hereby the bed of affliction, others the bed of ease and pleasure, others of weakness and infirmity, *etc.* But I have taken both *bed* and *night* in the most simple sense, to signify the time and place for most composed thoughts; comp. Ps. iv. 4"].

* [So WILLIAMS: "This dream shows how much the mind of the spouse was occupied with the object of her affection. He was the subject of her inquiry both by day and by night." BURROWES: "This illustrates the earnestness of a soul in seeking Jesus during a time of His absence"].

3. In this double confession of a love faithful unto death, which cannot rest until its longing for a complete and permanent union with the beloved object is appeased, is evidently disclosed the fundamental thought of this section of the piece. For the epiphonema to the daughters of Jerusalem (iii. 5) which is here again added as the concluding words of the entire act, has a subordinate significance as a refrain repeated verbatim from ii. 7 and only appears as a practical inference, with the limitations due to the time and the place from the real summit of contemplation before ascended, ver. 4. Applied to the entire body of the kingdom of God and especially to the relation of the New Testament child of God to his Lord and Saviour, this practical inference must necessarily assume a somewhat different as well as deeper and broader form and meaning than in its relation to the "daughters of Jerusalem." In the case of Christians the meaning of the loving desire and waiting of a bride, who can no longer live without her bridegroom, who feels herself to be wholly his as he is wholly hers, and who will then first be satisfied when his house has become hers, and her house his,—the meaning for Christians of such a bride-like longing is just a powerful admonition to strive after a complete and permanent union with the Saviour as the true bridegroom of souls, and not to let Him go until He has made His entry into both house and heart with all the fulness of His heavenly gifts. The Christian should not grow weary of longing for and imploring the advent of his Lord into his heart, until, become entirely His and His alone, he can say, "My beloved is mine and I am his," until he feels that his soul is espoused to Him as the bride to her bridegroom (John xiv. 23; xvii. 21 ff.). And as the Church, in so far as she is the true and proper bride of the Lord, cannot cease to long for His glorious appearing, by which she shall become one flesh with Him for ever and ever (Eph. v. 32; 2 Cor. xi. 2; Rev. xxii. 17), so also the soul of each individual Christian should be ever saying to the heavenly bridegroom, with the fervent petition of earnest love, "Come, Lord Jesus; come quickly." The typical exegete, whose task coincides in essential particulars with that of the practical expositor, must keep himself in the main to these principal and fundamental thoughts as suggested by the contents of this section devotionally considered, and must most carefully avoid, as destitute of the requisite exegetical basis, the too special exposition of details, such as *e. g.* the reference of the "clefts of the rock," ii. 14, to the wounds of Christ; of the "little foxes" to heretics and other seducers; of the "nights" to dark seasons of affliction; of the "watchmen" to angels, *etc.* Models of a truly edifying typical treatment of the Song of Solomon as a whole and of the present section in particular may be found in those precious pearls belonging to the hymnology of our Evangelical Church, which have drawn their loveliest figures and their most characteristic and leading motives from the ideas which underlie this section, without falling into a too labored or trifling allegorical interpretation of subordinate details, *e. g.* such hymns as W. C. DESSLER's "Friend of souls, how well is me," A. DRESE's "Bridegroom

Digitized by Google

of souls," P. GERHARD'S "Why then should I grieve?" L. LAURENTIUS' "Take courage, ye pious," CHR. SCRIVER'S "Life of my soul,"* *etc.*

* In the hymn of SCRIVER above quoted the refrain at the end of each stanza is "I am thine and thou art mine, I will no other's be."—P. GERHARD'S "Why then should I grieve?" ends with the following stanzas, suggestive of the same passage (Cant. ii. 6), as well as of iii. 4:

Lord, my Shepherd, fount of pleasure,
  Thou art mine, I am Thine,
No one can us sever.
  I am Thine, for me Thou savest,
And Thy blood, for my good,
  On the Cross Thou gavest.

Thou art mine, and I embrace Thee,
  Nought has might, O my Light,
From my heart t' erase Thee.
  Let me come, O bring me thither;
Thou with me, I with Thee,
  For aye shall be together.

In LAURENTIUS' *Advent Hymn*, "Take courage, ye pious," the fourth stanza, which describes the speedy coming of the bridegroom, is based upon the beautiful description of the reviving life of spring ii. 11-13:

He'll not be long delayed,
  Up from thy sleep arise;
The trees in bloom arrayed,
  And fair spring's brightening skies
Times of refreshing pledge.
  Predicts a beauteous day
The evening bathed in red,
  The darkness flees away, *etc.*

[As samples of English sacred verse suggested by this portion of the Song of Solomon may be mentioned the familiar hymns of WATT'S, "The voice of my beloved sounds," "Hark! the Redeemer from on high," "Often I seek my Lord by night," "Of all the joys we mortals know;" and upon the Song generally WATTS' *Hymns*, Book I. 66-78. Translations of some of the German hymns named in the text may be found in the *Lyra Germanica* and in Dr. SCHAFF'S "Christ in Song."—TR.]

THIRD SONG.

The solemn bringing of the Bride and the marriage at Jerusalem.

CHAP. III. 6.—V. 1.

FIRST SCENE:

THE ENTRY OF THE BRIDAL PAIR INTO JERUSALEM.

(CHAP. III. 6–11).

DAUGHTERS OF JERUSALEM (as spectators of the bridal procession).

6 Who[1] is this coming[2] up out of the wilderness,
  like pillars of smoke,
  perfumed[3] with myrrh and frankincense,
  with[4] every powder[5] of the merchant?—
7 Lo![6] Solomon's[7] own palanquin,[8]
  sixty heroes about it
  of the heroes[9] of Israel.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

1 [WIC.: The Synagogue, of the Church. MAT.: The voice of the Synagogue marvelling in itself at the Church of Christ].

2 [DOW.: That ascendeth by the desert as a little rod].

3 The Masoretic מְקֻטֶּרֶת, for which מְקֻטֶּרֶת (AQ., SYMM., VULG., LUTHER, SCHLOTTM. [so FRY]) is a mere shift to obtain an easier reading, is more correctly rendered "surrounded with perfumes," or "thoroughly perfumed," than with some recent interpreters "exhaling odors" (EWALD, UMBR., MEIER, REN.), [or "fuming," TAYLOR, WILLIAMS]; comp. WEISSBACH *in loc.* and the τεθυμιαμένη of the SEPT. [COV., MAT., CRAN., As it were a smell of].

4 This expression is also dependent upon מְקֻטֶּרֶת, so that מִן in מִכֹּל is consequently not comparative (DÖPKE) [so WILLIAMS, TAYLOR, doubtfully suggested also by AINSWORTH], but partitive as in i. 2. The clause if completed would therefore read: "Selected as aromatic powder from out of every sort of aromatic powder of the merchant, *i. e.* the best of all aromatic powders."

5 אֲבָקָה properly denotes simply "dust," but is here necessarily the dust of pounded spices. [Comp. ENG. VER., 1 Kin. x. 15. COV., MAT., CRAN., All manner spices. DOW., Aromatical spices. GENEV., All the spices].

6 [WIC., MAT.: The voice of the Church].

7 Literally: "Lo, his palanquin which is to Solomon." שֶׁל with the preceding suffix has an intensive signification, as i. 6; viii. 12.

8 [So rendered by GOOD, TAYLOR, PARKHURST, WILLIAMS, FRY, WITHINGTON, WEISS., GINSBURG. HARMER has "litter, palanquin or something of that sort;" so MOODY STUART, ROBINSON in GES. *Lex.*, DAVIDSON in FUERST'S *Lex.* NOYES: Carriage, a kind of open vehicle now usually called a palanquin; WICLIFFE: litil bed (litter); MATTHEWS: bedstead; other English versions: bed. Four different words are rendered "bed" in the authorised *English Version* of this Song: מִטָּה in this passage, עֶרֶשׂ in i. 16, מִשְׁכָּב in iii. 1, and עֲרוּגָה (a garden bed) in v. 13; vi. 2.—TR.]

9 On גִּבֹּרֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל comp. the precisely analogous expression גִּבּוֹרֵי בָבֶל Jer. li. 30.

Digitized by Google

8 All of them practised[1] with the sword, trained to war,[2]
each with his sword upon his thigh
against[3] fear in the nights.
9 A litter[4] has king Solomon made for himself
of the wood of Lebanon.
10 Its pillars he made of silver,
its support[5] of gold, its seat[6] of purple;
its interior[7] was embroidered, from love,
by the daughters of Jerusalem —
11 Come[8] out, ye daughters of Zion, and see
king Solomon with[9] the crown
wherewith his mother crowned him in the day of his nuptials
and in the day of the gladness of his heart.

SECOND SCENE:

SOLOMON AND SHULAMITH (at the wedding feast in the royal palace).

(CHAP. IV. 1.–V. 1.)

SOLOMON.

IV. 1. [10]Lo! thou art fair, my dear; lo! thou art fair,
thine eyes (are) doves[11] behind thy veil;[12]

[1] אֲחֻזֵי חֶרֶב lit. "taken of the sword," grasped, held by the sword, *i. e.* familiar with its management, practised in its use; comp. the like intransitive use of passive participles such as בָּטוּחַ, שָׁכוּן, זָכוּר (Ps. ciii. 14; cxii. 7; Judg. viii. 11), *etc.* [GENEV.: They all handle the sword. WICL., followed by the rest of the Eng. versions: holding swords; upon which GOOD remarks: "This is obviously inaccurate; for in the next member of the verse we are expressly told that their swords were undrawn and girt upon their thighs." HODGSON: "holders, possessors of swords, that is, warriors;" so MOODY STUART. GINSBURG: "skilled in the sword"].

[2] With מְלֻמְּדֵי מִלְחָמָה comp. the Homeric *διδασκόμενος πολέμοιο*, *Il.* 16, 811; only מְלֻמְּדֵי is a past participle. [The Hebrew participles do not, properly speaking, express relations of time. See GREEN's *Heb. Gram.* § 266].

[3] מִן here has the sense of מִהְיוֹת "that there may not be terror," *etc.* [GOOD: against the peril of the night; THRUPP: against nightly alarm]. EWALD's explanation "out of fear" is accordingly to be rejected; so is that of ROSENMUELLER, DÖPKE, VAIHINGER, *etc.*, who render מִן *because* of. [So ENG. VER]. Comp. פַּחַד לָיְלָה Ps. xci. 5.

[4] [WICL.: Of Christ and of the Church chosen of the Gentiles. He renders אַפִּרְיוֹן "chair;" COV., MAT.: bedstead; CRAN., BISH.: palace; GENEV.: palace or chariot (marg.); ENG. VER.: chariot or bed (marg.); DOW.: portable throne; GOOD: bridal couch; WILLIAMS: "carriage," which he explains as a "kind of palanquin of state;" MOODY STUART: "not a wheeled carriage but a litter or palanquin;" WORDSWORTH: litter or palanquin or sedan; TAYLOR, FRY, WITHINGTON, THRUPP, GINSBURG: palanquin; WEISS, who explains it of the most holy place in Solomon's temple: throne-chamber].

[5] רְפִידָה is scarcely the cover, the canopy of the sedan (EWALD, MAGN.), or the bottom of the couch (WEISSBACH), but rather its support for the back, as most recent interpreters correctly assume, with an eye to the SEPT. (*ἀνάκλιτον*) and the VULG. (*reclinatorium*). [WICL.: the leaning place; COV., MAT., CRAN., BISH.: covering; GENEV.: pavement; DOW.: seat; so WITHINGTON; ENG. VER.: bottom; GOOD: its inside (the wrought roof); TAYLOR: canopy; WILLIAMS: carpet; FRY: mattress; GINSBURG: support, that which supports the back when sitting; so WORDSWORTH, THRUPP; NOYES: railing; WEISS: overlaying (*i. e.* wainscot, plating)].

[6] מֶרְכָּב from רָכַב "to sit upon" is here unmistakably a "seat;" comp. Lev. xv. 9. [WICL.: the steiging up, identical in sense with the DOWAY: the going up, *i. e* the perpendicular sides; COV., MAT., CRAN., BISH.: seat, so WILLIAMS, THRUPP, NOYES; GENEV.: hangings, so GOOD, FRY, MOODY STUART, WEISS; ENG. VER.; covering; TAYLOR: the carriage body].

[7] [WICL.: The midst he adorned (DOWAY: covered) with charity for the daughters of Jerusalem. COV., MAT., CRAN.: the ground pleasantly paved for, *etc.* BISH.: the ground pleasantly paved with love. GENEV.: paved with the love of the daughters, *etc.* ENG. VER.: paved with love for, *etc.* WILLIAMS: lined (FRY: spread over) with love by, *etc.* GOOD: its covering is paved with needle work by his best beloved among the daughters, *etc.* NOYES: its interior curiously wrought by a lovely one of the, *etc.* GINSBURG: tesselated most lovely by, *etc.* THRUPP: tesselated with love because of, *etc.* WEISS: within it is strewn of love, *etc*].

[8] [WICL.: The voice of the Church, of Christ. MAT.: The Church speaking of Christ]. צְאֶינָה for צֶאנָה for the sake of the assonance here designed with רְאֶינָה; see EWALD, *Lehrb.* § 198, *b.* [GREEN's *Heb. Gram.* § 164, 3].

[9] [WICL., DOW.: in the diadem. THRUPP: gaze on king Solomon and on the crown].

[10] [WICL. The voice of Christ to the church. MAT. The voice of Christ. MAT., COV.: O how fair art thou, my love; how fair art thou; thou hast dove's eyes besides that which lieth hid within. Thy hairy locks are like a flock of sheep that be clipped, which go first up from the washing place.]

[11] [GENEV.: Thine eyes are like the dove's. DOW.: thine eyes as it were of doves. ENG. VER. thou hast dove's eyes.]

[12] EWALD takes מִבַּעַד to be synonymous with מִסָּבִיב and צַמָּה in the sense of "tress, lock of hair" (*i. e.* "about thy locks," similarly also UMBREIT). HENGSTENB. follows LUTHER in translating "between thy braids." But צַמָּה related to the CHALD. צְמַצֵם, צְמַם "to cover" (comp. TARG. on Gen xxxviii. 15.) cannot, as appears from Isa. xlvii. 2, mean anything but "veil;" and this meaning decides likewise in the case of מִבַּעַד in favor of the signification "forth from behind" or "through." [WICL.: Without it that within is hid. DOW.: besides that which lieth hid within. GENEV. "among thy locks" connected with what follows. ENG. VER., within thy locks; so AINSWORTH, GOOD, TAYLOR. FRY: tresses; THRUPP: plaits; PARKHURST, PERCY, WILLIAMS, WITHINGTON, WEISS, GINSBURG, WORDSWORTH: veil].

Digitized by Google

thy hair like a flock of goats,
reposing[1] on Mount Gilead.
2 Thy teeth like a flock of shorn[2] sheep,
which have come up from the washing,
all of which bear[3] twins,
and a bereaved one is not among them.
3 Like a crimson thread[4] thy lips,
and thy mouth[5] (is) lovely;
like a piece of pomegranate thy cheek[6]
behind thy veil.
4 Like the tower of David thy neck,
built for an armoury;[7]
a thousand bucklers are hung upon it,
all the shields[8] of heroes.
5 Thy two breasts are like two fawns,
twins of a gazelle,
that are feeding among lilies.

SHULAMITH.

6 Until[9] the day cools and the shadows flee,
I will get me to the mountain of myrrh
and to the hill of frankincense.

SOLOMON.

7 Thou[10] art all fair, my dear,
and there is not a blemish in thee.—
8 With me from Lebanon, my bride,
with me from Lebanon thou shalt come;
shalt journey[11] from the top of Amana,
from the top of Shenir and Hermon,
from dens[12] of lions,
from mountains of panthers.
9 Thou hast ravished[13] my heart, my sister, my bride,
hast ravished my heart with one of thy glances,
with one chain of thy necklace.

[1] Literally, "which have couched (שֶׁגָּלְשׁוּ) from Mount Gilead downward (מֵהַר גִּלְעָד) *i. e.* not "at the foot" of this mountain, but on it, so that they are visible to the beholder in a line from its summit. [DOW. which have come up from; CRAN., BISH.: are shorn. GENEV.: look down from; ENG. VER appear from, or eat of (marg); PARKHURST: glisten; FRY, after SCHULTENS; go in the morning to water; WITHINGTON, hang over the clefts of; THRUPP, hanging down the slope of; GINSBURG after FUERST in his *Lex.* (not his *Concord.* where he has "*decumbere, considere*") "springing down."]

[2] קְצוּבוֹת literally "shorn" *viz.:* sheep, רְחֵלִים vi. 6. [CRAN.: Thy teeth are like sheep of the same bigness, which went up from the washing place. GENEV.: a flock of sheep in good order.

[3] [GINSB. "paired; the Hiphil of תָּאַם to be double, to be pairs (Ex. xxvi. 24; xxxvi. 29) is to make double, to make pairs, to appear paired." FRY quotes from HENLEY's note in GREGORY's translation of LOWTH's *Lectures;* "The Arabic verb denotes not only to bring forth twins, but also to have a companion."]

[4] [DOW.: Scarlet lace: COV., MAT., CRAN., BISH., rose-colored ribbon; GENEV., ENG. VER., thread of scarlet.]

[5] [WICL.: thy fair speech sweet; COV., MAT., thy words are lovely; GENEV.: thy talk is comely; ENG. VER. thy speech is comely.]

[6] [WICL., COV., MAT., CRAN., BISH., DOW.; cheeks. GENEV., ENG. VER. temples.]

[7] [WICL.: with pinnacles. COV., MAT., DOW.: with bulwarks. CRAN., BISH.: with costly stones lying out on the sides. GENEV., for defence. GINSBURG follows RASHI and RASHBAM in taking תַּלְפִּיּוֹת as a contraction for הָאַלְפִּיּוֹת from אָלַף *to teach*, and renders: "for the builder's model, *i. e.* so that architects might learn their designs from it!"]

[8] [WICL. The armor of strong men. COV., MAT., CRAN., BISH.: the weapons of the giants. DOW.: the armor of the valiants.]

[9] [MAT. The spouse speaketh to himself. O that I might go to the mountain of myrrh and to the hill of frankincense till the day break and the shadows be past away.]

[10] [MAT. The voice of Christ speaking to the church.]

[11] תָּשׁוּרִי parallel with תָּבוֹאִי must be derived from שׁוּר in the sense of "journeying, travelling," confirmed by Isa. lvii. 9, not in that of "looking" (for which it is true Num. xxiii. 9, might be adduced); comp. SEPT. (ἐλεύσῃ καὶ διελεύσῃ), SYR., KÖST., MAGN., BÖTTCH, HITZ, *etc.* [This argument cannot be esteemed decisive except upon the assumption that parallel clauses must be identical in signification, which is not always nor even usually the case. WICL., DOW.: thou shalt be crowned. Other ENG. VERSIONS, look].

[12] [WICL. from the couching lions and the hill of paradise. WITHINGTON: from the cottages of Araoth, from the hills of Nemairim].

[13] In relation to this privative sense of לִבֵּב comp. *e. g.* סִקֵּל "to free from stones" (Isa. v. 2), שֵׁרֵשׁ "to uproot" (Ps. lii. 7; Job xxxi. 12), *etc.;* and for the thought comp. OVID's "*oculos, qui rapuere meos*" and the Greek θέλγειν which differs from βασκαίνειν in expressing an enchantment by love. [WICL., COV., MAT., GENEV., DOW., wounded. CRAN., BISH., bewitched. ENG. VER. marg.: taken away. GINSB.: emboldened. NOYES: taken captive. WEISS, who compares the German *herzen* to press to the heart: cherished.]

Digitized by Google

10 How fair is thy love,[1] my sister, my bride,
how much better thy love than wine,
and the fragrance of thy unguents than all spices.
11 Liquid honey thy lips distil, my bride,
honey and milk are under thy tongue,
and the fragrance of thy garments is like the fragrance of Lebanon.[2]
12 A garden locked[3] is my sister, my bride,
a spring locked, a fountain sealed.
13 Thy plants are an orchard of pomegranates,
with most excellent fruit;
cypress flowers with nards,
14 Nard and crocus, calamus and cinnamon,
with every variety of incense-woods;
myrrh and aloes,
with all the chief spice plants.
15 A garden spring[4] art thou, a well of living water,
and streams[5] from Lebanon.

SHULAMITH.

16 Awake,[6] north wind, and come thou south,
blow upon my garden that its spices[7] may flow!
Let[8] my beloved come to his garden
and eat his excellent fruits.[9]

SOLOMON.

V. 1 I[10] come to my garden, my sister, my bride,
I pluck my myrrh with my balsam,
I eat my honeycomb[11] with my honey,
I drink my wine with my milk.—
(*turning to the wedding guests*):
Eat[12] friends, drink,[13] and drink to repletion, beloved.

1 [WICL. teats. COV., MAT., CRAN., BISH., DOW.: breasts].
2 [WICL. incense. COV., MAT., DOW.: frankincense.]
3 [ENG. VER. inclosed, or barred (marg). COV., MAT.: Thou art a well-kept garden, O my sister, my spouse, thou art a well kept water spring, a sealed well. The fruits that sprout in thee are like a very paradise of pomegranates with sweet fruits.]
4 [THRUPP proposes a needless change of text: "The Hebrew text has מַעְיַן גַּנִּים 'a fountain of gardens.' This seems inappropriate: partly because the introduction of the 'gardens' tends to confusion with the previous image, partly because as that spoke of 'a garden' in the singular, we should hardly here have mention of 'gardens' in the plural. HOUBIGANT conjectured with unusual felicity, that for גנים we should read גלים; and this though unconfirmed by external authority, has so strongly the appearance of being the true reading, that we may without much rashness venture to accept it. The word denotes the waves of the fountain continually welling upwards.]
5 [COV., MAT., CRAN., BISH.: which run down. DOW.: which run with violence.]
6 [MAT. Christ calleth the heathen.]
7 [בְּשָׂמִים, here not the solid aromatic substances themselves as ver. 14, but the odors streaming from them; יִזְּלוּ the assonance with נֹזְלִים ver. 15, appears to be intentional. [COV., MAT., CRAN., BISH.: the smell thereof may be carried on every side.]
8 [In WICLIFFE's and the DOWAY BIBLE as in the VULGATE the fifth chapter begins here. WICL. The church saith of Christ.]
9 [COV., MAT.: eat of the fruits and apples that grow therein. DOW.: fruits of his apple trees.]
10 [WICL.: Christ saith to the church. MAT.: Christ speaketh to the church. WICL., COV., MAT.: Come into my garden O my sister, my spouse.]
11 [יַעַר lit. "a wood, thicket" here denotes the honey-comb, as in 1 Sam. xiv. 27 the feminine form יַעֲרָה (יַעְרַת הַדְּבַשׁ) prop. the rough or harsh in honey in contrast with the smoothly flowing.]
12 [WICL. Christ to the Apostles saith. MAT. Christ speaketh to the Apostles.]
13 [WICL.: be inwardly made drunken. COV., MAT., CRAN., BISH.: be merry, O ye beloved. GENEV.: make you merry, O well-beloved. ENG. VER.: drink abundantly, O beloved; marg. be drunken with loves.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. The contents of this section rightly understood, place it beyond doubt that iii. 6-11 describes a bridal procession, *i. e.*, the solemn bringing of a bride to her marriage, and iv. 1—v. 1 the marriage itself, or more exactly the loving conversation of the newly wedded pair at their nuptial feast. The dramatic vividness and life of the description reaches its highest point precisely in this middle section of the piece, and in fact, RENAN seems to be not altogether wrong when he says of it, or at least of its first scene (iii. 6–11): "No portion bears so many traces as this of a real representation, and even of a certain amount of stage apparatus and of costumes." Yet the thought of an actual perform-

Digitized by Google

ance (even if only in the private circle of a family engaged in a wedding feast, as RENAN proposes, pp. 83, ff.) is forbidden first by the fact that the dramatic style is not sufficiently sustained in the other acts, *e. g.* that which immediately precedes with its simple monologue; and secondly by the scanty change of person and the character of the dialogue in both the scenes of this act, which is more lyrical and subjective than dramatic and objective. For in the first instance with regard to iii. 6–11, the speaker in this section, although not the poet himself (HERDER, UMBREIT), is simply the band of the "daughters of Zion," ver. 11, whilst the principal personages, Solomon and Shulamith, remain mere objects of sight to these women of Jerusalem, and attended by a brilliant retinue pass mutely over the stage. Now since the spectators designated in ver. 11 as the daughters of Zion, are scarcely different from the "daughters of Jerusalem" elsewhere introduced (comp. on ver. 11), and little or nothing that is well founded can be alleged in favor of the assumption of those recent writers, who conceive the speakers to be "citizens" or "residents" of Jerusalem (EWALD, MAGNUS, DELITZSCH, HITZIG, RENAN), or "men and women" alternately (BÖTTCHER), or "courtiers of Solomon" even (WEISSBACH), it is just the chorus of the piece that speaks exclusively in this scene, the same chorus which made its appearance both speaking and acting only in the first part of the first act, while in the second part it withdrew more into the background, and in the second act did not come into view at all. A partition of the several utterances contained in the four strophes of the section (ver. 6, vers. 7, 8, vers. 9, 10, ver. 11) among different persons or groups of persons in the chorus is perhaps admissible, and this most probably so that the first three strophes may with DELITZSCH be put into the mouth of different particular groups, and the last (ver. 11) assigned to the whole body of spectators, or to "the entire festive multitude." Yet no greater multiplicity or life is thus gained for the action after all, for the discourse continues nevertheless to be limited exclusively to the persons of the chorus.—Again in iv. 1—v. 1 it is only Solomon and Shulamith, who are engaged in conversation, although they are not alone, but as v. 1 shows, in company with the merrily feasting wedding guests. The attempts of HITZIG and RENAN to bring more life and variety into the action by introducing the shepherd from ver. 8 onward, are to be rejected as empty conceits; especially that of the latter who makes the shepherd stand "at the foot of the seraglio-tower" (*au pied de la tour de serail*) as a languishing lover, and speak all from ver. 8 to ver. 16 *a* to his beloved, until she finally grants him admission, and he then v. 1 "celebrates together with the chorus the triumph of his love" (similarly also BÖTTCHER). The whole impression especially of what the enraptured bridegroom says in his description of the charms of his bride (iv. 1 ff., 9 ff.) is that of an extremely simple action, which aims at a description of the feelings of the loving pair at the celebration of their marriage and the utterances of their emotion far more than at an exhibition of what they did, and consequently betrays again more of a lyrical than a strictly dramatic character. But even if there really were reason to assume a scenic representation or at least a seriously intended destination to that end, no such indecent contents could in any case be admitted in this representation, as HITZIG and RENAN maintain, the former by his assertion that with what the bridegroom says v. 1 his conjugal embrace of the bride begins before the eyes of the spectators (!); the latter by his remark upon what he takes to be the words of the shepherd "*Il se rassure sur sa fidèlité* (*!*), *etc.* With as little propriety could a burlesque character be attributed to the representation, as is done by BÖTTCHER, who *e. g.* sees in v. 1*e* a direction from the shepherd to his comrades to fall upon the wine and the provisions of the wedding table and to drink themselves drunk.—Moreover the bride is with most of the recent interpreters (even UMBREIT, EWALD, VAIHINGER, RENAN, and most of the other advocates of the shepherd-hypothesis) to be supposed to be no other than Shulamith, and she exalted to the rank of a queen in the proper sense, a wife of Solomon preferred before all others, as is shown by the appellation "my sister bride," which is first used in iv. 9 ff., and further by the passage vi. 8, 9, as well as the fact that Shulamith is subsequently denominated a "prince's daughter," vii. 2. Neither iii. 6 where "out of the wilderness" is by no means to be explained of a coming of the bride from the south, nor iii. 11 (see *in loc.*) stands opposed to this assumption or compels a return to the opinion of many of the older writers that the bride was a daughter of Pharaoh coming up from Egypt. Solomon is besides to be thought of as participating in the festive procession, whether we imagine him seated in the sedan along with his bride or on horseback at the side of it. For the marriage customs of ancient Israel required (comp. 1 Macc. ix. 37, 39, and see above, p. 60) the bridegroom to bring the bride from the house of her parents with an honorable escort even though the distance from thence to his residence amounted to one or to several days' journey. And an intimation appears to be contained (ver. 8) in the mention of the "terrors of the nights" (see *in loc.*) that he had in fact conducted her by a march of several days to Jerusalem, and consequently had himself brought her from her home in Shunem. Against the view of DELITZSCH and SCHLOTTMANN ("*Der Brautzug des Hohenlieds,*" *Stud. und Krit.*, 1867, II., 289 f.) that Solomon himself was not with the bridal procession, but simply awaited its arrival, and at length, when it had come near enough, went forth from his palace to show himself to the bride and likewise to the festive multitude, may be urged not indeed the mention of the "sedan of Solomon" in ver. 7, for this is not necessarily a sedan in which Solomon himself is sitting, but the circumstance that Solomon is mentioned (ver. 11) in a manner which implies that he was with the festive procession rather than going to meet it or receiving it at the door of his palace. The contents of the preceding act had also prepared the way for Solomon's going to Shulamith and fetching her to Jerusalem himself, comp. p. 60.—After what has been already remarked, there can be no further doubt respecting the locality of the two scenes. In iii. 6–11

Digitized by Google

it is some street in Jerusalem, or more exactly (see ver. 6) an open area at one of the gates of the city, commanding a prospect of the desert region stretching north-east from the city toward Jericho (comp. DELITZSCH's somewhat too indefinite statement of the scene: "Neighborhood of Jerusalem and the city itself"). In iv. 1 to v. 1, however, it is the wedding hall of the royal palace, in which the newly married pair carry on their cosy talk somewhat apart from the guests sitting at the festive table; a hall which we must perhaps conceive (see on iv. 6) to have been immediately adjoining a garden and open outwards like the locality in the first act.—Between scene 1 and 2 we may perhaps suppose the marriage ceremony to have been performed by some of the priestly order; for according to Prov. ii. 17; Mal. ii. 14, such a religious act undoubtedly took place at the weddings of the ancient Hebrews (see the exegetical explanation of the former passage, in the commentary on Proverbs); and in chap. iv Solomon no longer speaks to his beloved as if they were simply betrothed, but as if they were actually married, see especially ver. 12 ff. With no valid reasons for it HITZIG makes the wedding ceremony take place between iv. 8 and 9. For the allegation that the language of Solomon does not become really "fond, affecting and languishing" until ver. 9 is purely subjective, and is not verified by the contents of vers. 9–16, comp. with vers. 1-7; and even if it were correct, it would not prove that a pause is to be assumed between vers. 8 and 9 to be filled up by the solemnization of the marriage.

2. THE BRIDAL PROCESSION, iii. 6-11.—FIRST STROPHE, ver. 6.

Ver. 6. **Who is this coming up out of the wilderness?** This "exclamation of admiration and praise" ("*voz de admiracion y de loor*" according to LUIS DE LEON) certainly does not refer to the sedan of Solomon approaching the city (HITZIG, WEISSBACH) any more than it does to Solomon with his retinue, as though מִי זאת were here to be taken as a neuter: "what is this," *etc.*, (EWALD and others); [so PERCY, GOOD, TAYLOR, WILLIAMS, GINSBURG]. The answer to the question here, as in the two passages (vi. 10 and viii. 5) where it recurs verbatim, can be no other than "Shulamith," the expected bride of the king, the heroine of the day, the prime object of interest and of curiosity to the residents of Jerusalem (correctly explained by all the older interpreters and among the more recent by DELITZSCH, VAIHINGER, HENGSTENBERG, SCHLOTTMANN, *etc.*). It is in their name and as expressive of their feelings that the chorus now speaks.

The verb "come up," literally "ascend" (עלה) simply denotes the ascent from the lower level of the surrounding country to the city situated upon a high mountain (comp. 1 Kin. xii. 28, *etc.*), not the perpendicular ascent of the pillar of smoke, with which Shulamith is compared in what follows, (HITZIG, WEISSBACH.) — Upon מִן־הַמִּדְבָּר SCHLOTTMANN correctly remarks: "'From the wilderness' is merely intended to suggest a general conception as if in describing a similar entry into one of our cities we were to say 'from the country.' The immediate vicinity of ancient Jerusalem was richly adorned with gardens and orchards, such as are not wholly wanting even now." For proof that an extremely desolate and barren rocky waste lies between Jerusalem and Jericho, and consequently in the very direction from which the festive procession coming from the north of Palestine must approach the city, comp. the unanimous accounts of modern travellers in Palestine, *e. g.*, one of the latest, K. FURRERS (*Wanderungen, etc.*, p. 147): "How silent and solitary it was here, (*viz.*, immediately beyond Bethany)! We looked in vain for a hut. Briers and fragments of rock covered the declivities. Yet even in this barren region small flocks of sheep and goats found here and there a scanty subsistence," *etc.* Comp. also ROBINSON's *Physical Gengraphy of the Holy Land.*—**Like pillars of smoke.** תִּימְרוֹת עָשָׁן (or תִּמְרוֹת עָשָׁן, Joel iii. 8) are neither "*elationes fumi*" as though the root, from which it is derived, were אמר=ימר "to be high" (EWALD, WEISSBACH), nor "clouds of smoke, whirls of smoke" (from ימר=מור *agitatus fuit*,—HENGSTENBERG), but palm-like high and slender pillars of smoke, as is shown by the unmistakably close affinity between תימרה and תמר "palm" [so BURROWES, WEISS]. The expression is, therefore, a poetical and descriptive synonym of the prosaic עַמּוּד עָשָׁן "pillar of smoke" Judg. xx. 40. Comp. KLEUKER: "A vertically ascending column of steam, which spreads out at the top into small clouds, has the shape of a palm-tree, whose upright trunk first rises in like manner high in the air and then divides into a like bushy crown." The tertium comparationis in the comparison of the approaching bride of the king with pillars of smoke is moreover two-fold: it is intended to set forth her slender, stately appearance and the dense volume of rare perfumes which stream forth from her (or her sedan) to delight the sense (comp. SCHLOTTMANN *in loc.*). In the worst possible taste, HITZIG: The figure has reference to the sedan, which is to be conceived of as "perhaps higher than it was long," and, since it rested on the shoulders of its tall bearers, as "projecting perpendicularly upwards." — **Perfumed with myrrh and incense.** As Prov. vii. 17 a bed and Ps. xlv. 9 the garments of the royal bridegroom, so here the bride coming to her wedding or more particularly her sedan and her dress are filled with refreshing perfumes (Prov. xxvii. 9). Comp. what CURTIUS RUFUS (VIII. 9, 28) relates of aromatic fumigations in the public processions of the kings of ancient India, as well as the accounts of modern travellers, such as TAVERNIER, *etc.*, respecting the custom formerly in vogue at the Turkish court in Constantinople of burning incense and aloes in silver chafing dishes at the formal reception of foreign ambassadors * (SCHMIDT, *Bibl. Geographus*, p. 78).

* ["The bride of Solomon is represented here as perfumed in a solemn procession made upon occasion of the king's entering with her into Jerusalem. The virgins went out to meet them, iii. 11; they burnt odors before them with a profusion that became a royal wedding, so that the smoke ascended like pillars. Or these pillars of smoke may refer to the burning perfumes in Jerusalem as a preparative for the reception of the royal pair." HARMER. "The bride was so richly provided with perfumes that they curled up in dense columns of smoke, visible at a distance as the procession moved along." THRUPP. "It is commonly supposed that the slender and

Digitized by Google

SECOND STROPHE, vers. 7, 8 (probably spoken by a different group of the women of Jerusalem from the first, comp. above No. 1.)

Ver. 7. **Lo! Solomon's own palanquin.***—The spectators beholding the procession now already quite near, perceive that the magnificent couch in the centre of it belongs to no less a person than Solomon himself, and hence immediately infer the high rank of her who sits within it, which is made still more apparent by the splendid surroundings of the palanquin.—**Sixty heroes about it of the heroes of Israel**—*i. e.*, probably from the number of those six hundred heroes or "mighty men" (גִּבּוֹרִים), with whom David had surrounded himself as his guard of honor or his general staff (comp. 2 Sam. x. 7; [xv. 18]; xvi. 6; xx. 7; xxiii. 8 ff.) and which undoubtedly still formed under Solomon the flower of the Israelitish army, or in part at least, a sort of standing body-guard about the king (comp. 2 Sam. xv. 1; 1 Kings i. 5). At any rate, the sixty heroes here appear as a guard of honor, which had attended him on his bridal journey for his beloved.†

Ver. 8. **Against fear in the nights**—*i. e.*, that fear may not be excited in the nights; for פַּחַד is not objective terror, that which produces terror (DELITZSCH, HENGSTENBERG,) [GINSBURG], but subjective terror, being frightened out of sleep (Job iv. 14; Ruth iii. 8). The meaning is evidently this: to secure her while travelling from sudden alarm and consequent disturbance of her slumber at night upon her way to Jerusalem (not after her arrival there, as HITZIG claims), the sixty sword-begirt heroes were assigned to her as her escort. As the journey from Shunem to Jerusalem amounts to about fifty miles in a direct course, and consequently made it necessary to pass at least one and perhaps two nights on the route, and this very probably in a wild solitary region (בַּמִּדְבָּר, ver. 6), such a military escort was by no means superfluous. At a later time also, when Shulamith was urging a return to her home (vii. 12), she takes for granted that it would be necessary to spend several nights in villages upon the way.

THIRD STROPHE. Vers. 9, 10 (again spoken by a fresh division of the chorus).

Ver. 9. **A litter has King Solomon made for himself.**—אַפִּרְיוֹן, though difficult of explanation etymologically, denotes according to the ancient versions and rabbinical tradition a portable couch, a litter (according to KIMCHI, a bride's litter* in particular; a similar view in *Sot.* IX. 14). It is therefore to be regarded as identical with the מִטָּה, ver. 7. In opposition to HITZIG, who declares the two to be distinct, and places the king in the מִטָּה, and the bride, whom he thinks to be coming to meet him, in the אַפִּרְיוֹן see particularly SCHLOTTMANN, p. 229 ff.; also WEISSBACH, p. 177, who correctly observes that the remark before us, as well as that contained in strophe 2 (vers. 7, 8), is related to the question in ver. 6, and must therefore, like that first answer, point to a female person as the occupant of the litter referred to. In an etymological point of view, HITZIG's explanation of אַפִּרְיוֹן as related to the Sanskrit *paryâna*, "saddle, riding-saddle," and consequently as not properly denoting a couch for lying down, but a portable chair (comp. the SYR., which takes the word as a synonyme of כִּסֵּא), may deserve to be preferred above all others, especially if we might also adduce with it the Indian *paryang*; "bed," compared by BÖTTCHER (*Suppl. Lex. Aram.*, p. 49). For neither the derivation from the Greek attempted long ago by JEROME (on Isa. vii. 14), as though it were identical with the *φορεῖον* of the SEPT. (so among the later writers, MAGNUS and SCHLOTTMANN), nor the various recent attempts to refer it to some Semitic root, *e. g.*, to the Chald. פרא, *currere* (hence properly equivalent to *currus*, GESENIUS) [chariot, ENG. VER.], or to פאר=פרא, "to be handsomely adorned, to shine" (WEISSBACH), or to פרה, whether in the sense of "spreading out," or in that of "cutting neatly, executing elegant workmanship" (EWALD, MEIER, DELITZSCH, *etc.*, all of whom compare the Chald. פּוּרְיָא, bed), or finally to פרר—פרה, *ferri* (WISEMAN, *Hor. Syr.*, and GESEN.-DIETR. in the *Handwörterbuch*, comparing the "*ferculum*" of the *Vulg.* and the *Syr. ph'rato*, "cradle")—none of these attempts at explanation are really satisfactory in a linguistic point of view. But even if the "Appiryon" is properly a portable seat, it may still be identical with the "Mittah," ver. 7; for as a travelling sedan it was doubtless arranged both for sitting and for reclining, and was spacious enough to afford room for Solomon along with Shulamith. It

graceful form of the bride gradually increasing in tallness as she came nearer, is compared to the light and beautiful column of smoke which ascends from a burning censer of incense. But is it not more probable that the dust caused by the approach of the sedan and its attendants is compared to columns of smoke? Or might not the pillars of smoke actually ascend from censers borne in front of the procession?" NOYES. The GENEVAN version here has this note: "This is referred to the church of Israel which was led by the wilderness forty years." "The reference is evident to the marching of the children of Israel through the wilderness, with the pillar of cloud before them and with the pillars of smoke ascending from the altar of incense in the sight of the priests, and from the altar of atonement in the sight of all Israel" MOODY STUART. So allegorical interpreters generally, who find in this one of the indications of the spiritual meaning of the Song. "She came perfumed with myrrh and frankincense, because myrrh was one of the principal ingredients in her holy ointment (Ex. xxx. 22), and incense was offered constantly on the golden altar before the veil; and because myrrh is the symbol of the death and burial to which Christ condescended as man; and because frankincense is the type of prayer offered by Him as our priest and offered to Him as God. And she is perfumed with all the powders or spices of the merchant because all the glories of the ancient ritual are spiritualized in the gospel." WORDSWORTH.]

* ["A travelling litter is here intended." THRUPP. "Either a howdah, to be borne on the back of a camel instead of an elephant, or a palanquin to be carried on the shoulders of men, or to be borne as a litter between two camels, horses or mules." KITTO. WORDSWORTH follows HENGSTENBERG in supposing an allusion to the marriage bed, which is manifestly at variance with the context.—TR.]

† [THRUPP after PATRICK: "The number of David's heroes, 'thirty and seven in all,' was exactly thirty exclusive of those who stood superior to the rest in rank; and if the number three-score have any definite meaning in the present verse, it is probably to be taken as the double of the number of the heroes of David's reign. A comparison, however, of this verse with vi. 8 may furnish ground for regarding sixty as a determinate number used for an indeterminate." WORDSWORTH allegorizes thus: "twice thirty, twice David's number, because the two armies of Christ's soldiers (viz.: the Gentile and the Jew) are here represented as united in the army of the peaceful Solomon, Christ."]

* ["It seems to signify the nuptial bed, or an open chariot, or some such like thing, in which the bride was carried in pomp to the bridegroom's house; and in this sense is the word used in the Mishnah."—GILL.]

Digitized by Google

is more natural, however, and likewise corresponds better with decorum and with the marriage customs of the ancient Hebrews to imagine the king riding along side or seated on a separate litter of a less showy sort. For the Hindoo bridal custom, according to which both bride and groom were carried along together in one large palanquin, can scarcely determine the usage under the Old Testament (comp. SCHLOTTMANN, *in loc.*).—"Has made for himself" is, according to 2 Sam. xv. 1; 1 Kings i. 5, equivalent to "procured, provided for himself," *comparavit sibi*, not exactly=*faciendum curavit*, "caused to be made" (for which Esth. vii. 9 has been alleged).—**Of the wood of Lebanon**—literally: "from the woods of Lebanon," *i. e.*, from various costly species of wood found on this mountain, particularly cedars and cypresses, comp. 1 Kings v. 10; vi. 15; vii. 2, as well as i. 17 above.*—**Its pillars he made of silver.**—So that only the frame of the sedan was of those valuable woods, not its various decorations, which belonged to its inner as well as its outer fitting up. עַמּוּדִים are not the feet of the couch, as though the κλῖναι ἀργυρόποδες (XENOPH., *Anab.* IV., 4, 21; *Athen.* II., 9), or the Roman tables with silver legs (*Juven.* II., 128), were to be compared, but the small pillars designed mainly for ornament, not as supports, with which the sedan was embellished; comp. the *auratæ columnæ* of a royal sedan spoken of by CURTIUS, IX. 8, 26, as well as the mention of Indian palanquins with silver pillars by v. ORLICH, *Indische Reise*, p. 128.—**Its seat of purple.**—By this are meant not cushions, but costly coverings, which were spread over the hard wooden base; comp. Judg. v. 10; Am. iii. 12; Prov. vii. 16.—**Its interior was embroidered from love by the daughters of Jerusalem.**—The suffix in תּוֹכוֹ, like that of the three preceding words, can only refer back to the principal subject אַפִּרְיוֹן, not to the purple of the coverings (MAGN., HITZIG). Since the back and the seat have been mentioned before, the "midst" or "inside" of this elegant litter can mean nothing but the sides and top of the same vehicle. The decoration of these inner portions of the sedan is characterized by the participle רָצוּף (from רצף to arrange together, combine, comp. רִצְפָּה, "tesselated pavement"), as consisting in figures arranged together to resemble mosaic, which points to fine embroidery, for these figures cannot be conceived to be upon any thing but the coverings which lined the walls.† Consequently nothing is more obvious than to see in the "daughters of Jerusalem" the makers of this embroidery, and in אַהֲבָה *love*, which is added to limit the participle רָצוּף the mention of the disposition, impelled by which the daughters of Jerusalem performed this work. The מִן in מִבְּנוֹת is therefore equivalent to "from, or on the part of," and does not introduce the agent after a passive verb* (as HITZIG and other opponents of this construction suppose), which would certainly be contrary to usage. The SEPT. is substantially correct, only אַהֲבָה is taken as in recent times, *e. g.*, by VAIHINGER, in the sense of a "token or gift of love:" so HERDER, DELITZSCH and others. On the contrary, it is incorrectly rendered by LUTHER (who partially follows the VULGATE): "paved within in a lovely manner for the sake of the daughters at Jerusalem;" also by UMBREIT: "adorned from love to the daughters of Jerusalem;" HENGSTENB.: "adorned with the love of the daughters of Jerusalem" (as though they were themselves seated inside of the sedan); BÖTTCHER: "adorned with one, who is beloved beyond the daughters of Jerusalem," *i. e.*, far more than they; and finally DOEDERL., EWALD, WEISSBACH, RENAN, HITZIG, SCHLOTTMANN: "adorned with a love from among the daughters of Jerusalem"—as though אַהֲבָה here meant the same as *amata* (which is in reality not the case either here or any where else in the Song of Solomon; see above on ii. 7 and comp. on vii. 7) or as though instead of this expression we were required in spite of MSS. and versions to read אֲהֻבָה (as in Hos. iii. 1; Deut. xxi. 15) or אֲהָבָה (comp. Hos. ix. 10), as HITZIG in fact proposes. The same interpreter infers from מִבְּנוֹת יְרוּשָׁלָם that the royal bride denoted by אהבה is not Shulamith, but a native of Jerusalem, whilst the rest of the advocates of this last named view take the "daughters of Jerusalem" here in the wider sense of "daughters of Israel" (see particularly SCHLOTTMANN).

FOURTH STROPHE. Ver. 11 (spoken by the whole body of the chorus).

Ver. 11. **Come out, daughters of Zion.**—This form of address is adopted instead of "daughters of Jerusalem," which had just been used at the close of verse 10, merely for the sake of varying the expression, not to distinguish the ordinary women of the city from the ladies of the court (EWALD, HITZIG, *etc.*) [so GINSB.]. The coming out here urged is not necessarily the coming out of individuals from their houses; it is sufficient to suppose the interior of the city contrasted with the open space at one of the gates where the action is proceeding (see above No. 1, p. 72).—**And gaze at king Solomon with the crown wherewith his mother crowned him,** *etc.* By this crown is neither meant the royal bride herself, as though she were here entitled the crown of her husband as in Prov. xii. 4 (VAIH., HENGSTENB.), nor is the

* [TAYLOR is peculiar in connecting the last words of ver. 9 with ver. 10 thus: "A nuptial palanquin hath king Solomon made for himself. He hath made of Lebanon-wood its pillars (the poles of the palanquin, and perhaps the whole of its wood-work); of silver (tissue) its canopy; of gold (tissue) its lower carriage (lit., the *ridden in* part, which hangs by cords from the pillars or poles); with purple its middle part (floor) is spread, a present from the daughters of Jerusalem (a finely wrought carpet,) or wrought with an ornamental pattern of needle-work."]

† [PATRICK supposes a reference to the "foot-cloth, which lay at the bottom of the chariot, with elegant figures of shepherds and shepherdesses perhaps and all their innocent courtships." MOODY STUART mentions (without adopting) an opinion also suggested by FRY and Mrs. FRANCIS that "verses expressive of love were wrought into the fabric" of the inner lining. STUART insists upon the strict meaning of a "pavement of stone," and applies the description to the "ark of the covenant with the tables of the law as the chariot of the divine king of Israel."—TR.]

* [So PERCY: "The middle thereof is wrought (in needle-work) by the daughters of Jerusalem (as a testimony of their) love." WILLIAMS: "The preposition is not most usually *by* but *from*. In the present instance it probably includes both—lined with love *by* the daughters of Jerusalem, and probably received as a present *from* them."]

Digitized by Google

expression a general figurative designation of Solomon's sovereignty or his glory as a conqueror (STARKE and many of the older commentators; also HAHN). We are rather to look upon it as a proper festive crown, a wedding coronet of gold and silver (scarcely of fresh flowers), such as probably not only brides but bridegrooms were accustomed to wear at Israelitish weddings, as was the custom at least in later times according to the testimony of the Talmud; * see SELDEN, *Uxor Ebr.* II. 139 f.; HIRT, *de coronis apud Hebræos nuptialibus sponsi sponsæque*, Jen. 1748.—That it was no other than Solomon's mother,† who put this crown upon his head, is not to be explained from the fact that mothers generally take a special interest in such matters of ornament (HITZIG), but from a peculiar marriage custom, according to which the mother in token of her approval of the marriage alliance contracted by her son, with her own hand adorned him with a festive crown. It is still a question, however, whether the reference is to that wedding crown, which Solomon had previously worn upon his marriage with the Egyptian princess, 1 Kin. iii. 1, and which in order to distinguish the present new bride above others he had now brought out anew (EWALD), or whether as "the new love deserved a new crown" (HITZIG), we are to assume that the crowning was first performed by Bathsheba in honor of the present nuptial celebration (so the most). The latter assumption is favored not only by the tenor of the words used (see particularly "and in the day of the gladness of his heart" in *d*) but also by the circumstance that Bathsheba, Solomon's mother, probably survived David, her royal husband, a number of years, and continued to be a highly respected and influential person at the court of Solomon; comp. 1 Kin. i. 11; ii. 13 ff.

3. SOLOMON TO SHULAMITH AT THE WEDDING ENTERTAINMENT, iv. 1-6.

Ver. 1. **Lo, thou art fair, my dear,** *etc.*—The verbal correspondence of this praise of Solomon's beauty with i. 15 is designed as in vi. 4 (and so in vi. 10; viii. 5 comp. with iii. 6) to direct attention to Solomon as again the speaker of these words. And it follows with great probability that the person addressed is likewise the same as before, not some new object of the king's love different from Shulamith, as HITZIG asserts. —**Behind thy veil.**—So correctly HITZIG, VAIH., HEILIGST., *etc.*, with whom BÖTTCH. and GESEN.-DIETR., ("through thy veil," *i. e.*, appearing through) substantially agree.*—**Thy hair like a flock of goats which repose on Mount Gilead.**—As Gilead is visible from the Mount of Olives in the far distance, but not from Jerusalem, its mention, like that of Lebanon and Hermon in ver. 8, and like so many other allusions in the poem to localities in the north of Palestine, is to be explained from the circumstance that when Solomon was speaking to his beloved, he liked to transport himself to the region of her home with its peculiar circle of impressions and ideas. Gilead is, besides, a mountain land specially rich in cattle (comp. Num. xxxii. 1; Mic. vii. 14; Jer. l. 19), and modern travellers have found it still strewn, as it were, with flocks and herds. Comp. ARVIEUX, II., 688; PAULUS, *Reisen*, 7, 108; ROSENM., *Morgenl.*, I., 85, *etc.*—The point of comparison in the figure is to be found mainly in the glossy blackness and luxuriant abundance of Shulamith's hair, perhaps also in its silky softness and delicacy, less likely in her elegant and elaborately braided tresses, to which MAGNUS thinks there was subordinate reference. Old LUIS DE LEON correctly (in *Wilkens*, p. 219): "He indicated thus the abundance and the color of her hair; for the goats, which pastured there, were dark and glossy. He says therefore: as the goats scattered on the summit of Gilead give it a fine and pretty appearance, whilst before it looked like a bald and arid rock, so does thy hair adorn and ornament thy head by its rich color and abundance."

Ver. 2. **Thy teeth like a flock of shorn sheep.**—Sheep recently shorn, consequently smooth, and besides just washed in the pool, and hence snow-white, evidently are a peculiarly appropriate figure for dazzling white teeth, provided pastoral figures or those taken from the realm of country life were to be used at all. And this was to a certain extent necessary here; at least it was extremely natural to illustrate the contrast between the blackness of her hair and the whiteness of her teeth by adding a flock of white lambs to the flock of black goats spoken of in ver. 1. The idea of the pool for the sheep spontaneously offered itself, since washing newly shorn sheep was a universal custom in antiquity; comp. COLUMELLA's advice (VII. 4) to wash sheep four days after the shearing.—**All of which bear twins, and one bereaved is not among them.**—An allusion to the completeness of her teeth, the two rows of which, upper and lower, not only have no breaks, but in every instance exhibit a pair of teeth exactly answering to one another, twin teeth, as it were, throughout.† That sheep in the East are still

* ["It was usual with many nations to put crowns or garlands on the heads of new married persons. The Mishnah informs us that this custom prevailed among the Jews; and it should seem from the passage before us that the ceremony of putting it on was performed by one of the parents. Among the Greeks the bride was crowned by her mother, as appears from the instance of Iphigenia in Euripides, ver. 906. BOCHART supposes the nuptial crown and other ornaments of a bride alluded to in Ezek. xvi. 8-12; *Geogr. Sacr.* p. 2, l. 1.—The nuptial crowns used among the Greeks and Romans were only chaplets of leaves or flowers. Among the Hebrews they were not only of these, but occasionally of richer materials, as gold or silver, according to the rank or wealth of the parties." PERCY. To this GOOD adds: "It was customary equally among the Greeks and Orientals to wear crowns or garlands of different degrees of value, in proportion to the rank of the person presenting them, on festivals of every description; but those prepared for the celebration of a nuptial banquet as being a festivity of the first consequence, were of peculiar splendor and magnificence."]

† [WITHINGTON is alone in finding not Solomon's mother, but his mother-in-law, in this passage; he renders thus: "wearing the wreath which his (new rural) mother wove for him in the day of his espousals (to her daughter)."

* [PERCY gives the preposition a privative sense, and translates "now thy veil is removed." He supposes that the royal pair having alighted from their carriage, the ceremony of unveiling the bride here follows, which gives occasion to the bridegroom's encomium on those features which the veil in great measure concealed. But WILLIAMS observes that the "Eastern poets celebrate the charms of the fair through their veils, and improve this circumstance into an elegant compliment." AINSWORTH and others remark upon the circumstance that seven particulars are here mentioned in the description of the bride, viz.: her "eyes, hair, teeth, lips, temples, neck and breasts," uniting, as MOODY STUART expresses it, "perfection of number with perfection of beauty."—TR.]

† [GINSBURG adopts the translation of LOWTH, PERCY and FRY with advantage to the figure: "*All of which are paired.* That is, each upper tooth has its corresponding lower one;

Digitized by Google

mostly διδυμοτόκοι, *i. e.*, have two lambs at a time, is testified by recent travellers, *e. g.*, the anonymous author of the publication, "*Ægypten wie es jetzt ist*," p. 42 (comp. MAGN. *in loc.*). L. DE LEON (in the same place as before) has again finely shown the sensible and striking character of the comparison here selected: "The figure almost paints the whole thing before our eyes. The flock of sheep, which always go crowded together like the scales of fir cones, represent the compactness and smallness of her teeth: their whiteness is expressed by their coming up from the washing; their uniformity by none being sick or barren."

Ver. 3. **Like a crimson thread thy lips, and thy mouth is lovely.**—The lips immediately follow the teeth, not simply because they cover them (HITZIG), but also because the bright red of the one forms an elegant contrast with the dazzling whiteness of the other; comp. the combination of the two colors in v. 10. Then the mouth, comprehending both teeth and lips, stands here in its quality of an organ of speech, whence also it is called מִדְבָּר from דָּבַר, "to speak," and is supplied with a predicate (נָאוֶה, lovely; comp. ii. 14; i. 15), which serves to characterize not so much its pretty shape or color as the agreeable and beneficent effects proceeding from it. The SEPT., VULG., SYR., HENGSTENB., *etc.*, take מִדְבָּר as equivalent to speech; A. SCHULTENS and DÖPKE, to tongue; HITZIG, to palate. But like all that is described before and after, this expression must denote some part of the body, and one too that is externally visible, and which forms a substantial feature of Shulamith's beauty.—**Like a piece of pomegranate thy cheek.**—רַקָּה literally "the temple" (Judg. iv. 21; v. 26), here manifestly the upper part of the cheek, whose soft red borders upon the white of the temple. For this figure of the half of a pomegranate (פֶּלַח הָרִמּוֹן) refers to the pleasing combination of white and red; on one side of the exterior of this fruit "a bright red is mingled with yellow and white," whilst the other side looks brown (DÖPKE). It is only to a half, a segment* (פֶּלַח from פלח, "to cut fruit," 2 Kings iv. 39) of the pomegranate that the cheek is compared because its soft curve only corresponds in fact to the segment of a sphere. Not, therefore, "like a slice of a pomegranate" (LUTH.) [so DURELL, HODG., THRUPP], as though the flat inner surface of a sliced pomegranate were intended (HENGSTENB., HAHN., *etc.*). For the appearance of the reddish seeds of this fruit, lying in a yellowish pulp, would not form a suitable comparison, whether for a cheek or a temple.

Ver. 4. **Like the tower of David thy neck, built for an armoury.** His aim was not to describe the slender grace and erectness of Shulamith's neck in and of itself, but likewise with reference to its ornaments consisting of brilliant jewelry and ornamental chains (comp. i. 9-11) and consequently in respect to its superb and stately appearance (comp. vii. 5 [4]). A pecularly suitable comparison was accordingly offered to the king in the tower, hung around with burnished pieces of armor, and probably built of white free-stone, which David may have erected somewhere in the vicinity, perhaps at one corner of his palace on Zion as a bulwark or a watch tower.* The identity of this tower with the "tower of Lebanon which looks toward Damascus" mentioned in vii. 5 (4) is contradicted by the fact that the latter is a figure for an entirely different thing from that now before us (*versus* EWALD, HITZIG, *etc.*). Still less can the ivory tower spoken of in the very same passage be identical with this. This manifestly appears from the further defining clauses "built for an armory," *etc.*, to have been a fortification, a stronghold for arms, a tower for warlike purposes, and hence, perhaps, is not distinct from the "house of the mighty" (בֵּית הַגִּבּוֹרִים) spoken of in Neh. iii. 16, which is assigned to the neighborhood of the district of Beth-zur and the sepulchres of David, *i. e.*, on the eastern side of Zion, on the very spot where David's old palace must have stood (comp. WEISSBACH *in loc.*)—The difficult expression תַּלְפִּיּוֹת, which the LXX render as a proper name (Θαλφιώθ), the VULG. by *propagnacula*, AQ., and the *Versio Veneta* by ἐπάλξεις, is most correctly taken with KIMCHI for a compound of תֵּל *collis* (*const.* תֵּל) and פִּיּוֹת *enses*, edges, sword-blades (Prov. v. 4; Judg. iii. 16; comp. Ps. cxlix. 6), or which amounts to the same thing, referred to תלה "to hang" and פִּיּוֹת in the same sense as before (HENGSTENB., DEL., WEISSB., *etc.*). In both cases it must designate a lofty object of the nature of a fortification, hung around with swords or bristling with swords, consequently, as mention is also made of shields in what follows, an armory which, as it served for the preservation of numerous martial weapons of offence and defence, was likewise hung around with them on the outside, and thus embellished. For the shields hung on it (עָלָיו) according to the next clause of the verse, and not barely in it (as HITZIG supposes, who fancies a "mound of earth," which "hides in its bosom such murderous weapons" as swords, shields, *etc.* This explanation is at any rate better suited to the connection and yields a more appropriate figure for Shulamith's neck decorated with brilliant ornaments than the derivation of תַּלְפִּיּוֹת from a substantive תַּלְפִּי, which, according to the Arab., would mean "host, army" (EWALD: "built for troops;" BÖTTCH., RÖDIG., compare HEILIGST.), or from an alleged adjective

thus they, as it were, appear in pairs, like this flock of white sheep, each of which keeps to its mate, as they come up from the washing pool. *And no one of them is deprived of its fellow*, *i. e.*, no tooth is deprived of its corresponding one, just as none of the sheep is bereaved of its companion. The teeth surely, which are here compared to the flock, cannot be said to bear twins like the sheep."]

* [CASTELLUS, followed by PATRICK, GOOD and others: the opening flower or blossom of the pomegranate. WILLIAMS: "If the bridal veil of the Hebrew ladies was like that of the Persians, made of red silk or muslin, it would throw a glow over the whole countenance that will account more fully for this comparison."]

* [GOOD: "The graceful neck of the fair bride is compared to this consummate structure; and the radiance of the jewels that surrounded it to the splendor of the arms and shields with which the tower of David was adorned. The simile is exquisite."]

Digitized by Google

תַּלְפִּי *exitialis*, destructive, hence תַּלְפִּיּוֹת *exitialia*, *viz. arma*, murderous weapons, or from לָבַן=לפה to be white, hence "pieces of alabaster" (HAHN), and the like.*—**All the shields of heroes.** שְׁלָטִים has a wider meaning than מָגֵן, which specially denotes the "shield of a light armed soldier," the "target;" see GESEN. *Thes.*, p. 1418. We are scarcely to think of the shields of conquered heroes, of those for instance which David (2 Sam. viii. 7) had taken from the Syrians (versus WEISSB.), because the mighty men here mentioned are simply referred to as the garrison of the armory here described. Comp., moreover, Ezek. xxvii. 11, a passage which is probably based on that before us.

Ver. 5. **Thy two breasts like two fawns, twins of a gazelle, that are feeding among lilies.** On *c* comp. ii. 16. The comparison is plainly intended to express "delicate and exquisite beauty" (HITZ.); for since the gazelle itself, when full grown, is an admirable, attractive and favorite emblem of womanly grace and loveliness (Prov. v. 19; comp. above on ii. 7, 9), a twin pair of its young lying on a bed covered with lilies appears to be still better fitted to illustrate the fragrant delicacy and elegance of a chaste virgin bosom veiled by the folds of a dress redolent of sweet odors (comp. i. 13). A more detailed parcelling out of the comparison (as for instance by HITZIG, who thinks that the dress was red, or by WEISSB., who supposes a particular reference in the young gazelles to the dark-colored nipples of her breasts as their especial charm, and in the lilies to the snowy whiteness of her bosom) is inadmissible, and leads to what is in violation of good taste or to what is obscene, from both which the poet has kept free here as every where else. Admirably here again LUIS DE LEON (p. 221, f.): "In addition to the delicacy of the young kids, in addition to their similarity as twins, in addition to their loveliness and gentleness they have in their merry gambols a frolicksomeness and gayety, which irresistibly enchains the eyes of beholders, and attracts them to come near and touch them," *etc.*

Ver. 6. **Until the day cools and the shadows flee I will get me to the mountain of myrrh and to the hill of frankincense.** If Solomon were still the speaker in these words, nothing else could possibly be meant by the mountain of myrrh and the hill of frankincense, but the breasts of the bride which would be so designated here in facetious and flowery style (EWALD, HEILIGST., WEISSB., REN., *etc.*,) with allusion to the fragrant substances, which were between them or upon them* (comp. i. 13). But the very circumstance, that then the foregoing figure for the bosom would here be followed by one entirely new and of a different description, whilst every other part of the body spoken of in this section is represented by but a single figure (see vers. 1–4) makes it improbable that the words before us belong to Solomon. To which may be added that עַד שֶׁיָּפוּחַ הַיּוֹם, *etc.*, must belong to Shulamith here as well as in ii. 17; and that BÖTTCHER's attempt to assign only these introductory words to the "vinedresser" as he calls her, and the latter part of the verse from אֵלֶךְ לִי onward to the king who interrupts her, seems scarcely less arbitrary than HITZIG's view that the whole verse is spoken by the shepherd, who suddenly enters and declares his purpose to effect the speedy rescue of Shulamith! UMBR., DÖPKE, VAIH., DELITZSCH, *etc.*, properly assign the words to Shulamith, who seeks thus to parry the ardent encomiums of Solomon, and hence expresses the wish to leave the wedding hall resounding with the boisterous festivities of the guests until the approach of evening. The "mountain of myrrh" and the "hill of frankincense," which she wishes to visit for this end, were probably certain localities about the royal palace, near the hall and visible from it, which either always bore those names or only on the occasion of the present marriage, to which fumigations with various spices belonged as an absolutely indispensable ingredient, comp. iii. 6. As presumably solitary, shady spots, belonging, it may be, to grounds laid out as gardens (perhaps "beds of balsam" of the sort mentioned in v. 13, raised in the shape of pyramids or towers), these must have been to the simple-minded, guileless child of nature more desirable places to stay in than the noisy festive hall. Comp. her similar expressions of a strong desire for the fresh solitude of nature in opposition to the luxurious life of the court; i. 7, 16, and especially vii. 12 (11) ff. This understanding of the "mountain of myrrh," *etc.*, is evidently

* ["Our first business is here with the controverted word לְתַלְפִּיּוֹת, our translation of which "with projecting parapets," is in partial accordance with, and derives support from that of SYMMACHUS, εἰς ἐπάλξεις (*al.* ἐπάνω ἐπάλξεων). The word תלפיות, or rather its singular תלפיה [better תלפית] is regularly derived from the root לפה. That root is, according to BUXTORF, actually found in the Chaldee in the Targum of JONATHAN on Lev. vi. 5; although in the Targum, as printed by WALTON, we read not ילפי but יוסף. However, whether the root be used or no, its meaning may be assumed to be identical with that of לפף, which is found in other places in the Targum of ONKELOS. The meaning is "to add on," "to join on." The substantive derived from it, when applied to a building, would thus naturally denote the projecting parts of the building, which seem as it were to be added on to the rest. We have an analogous term in the Chaldee לופין, derived from the same root as תלפיות, and used in the Talmud of strongly marked eyebrows. The projecting parapets of a tower are in fact its eyebrows. And that ancient towers were built with such projecting parapets, and moreover that shields were hung by way of display on the exterior of the parapets, is established in the most satisfactory manner by a representation on a bas-relief at Kouyounjik, given by LAYARD, and also in SMITH's *Dict. of the bible*, *s. v. Gammadims*. Of the current explanations of תלפיות, the only one which seems to call for notice, is that which derives it from תלה "to hang," פיות "edges," and makes it mean "an armory." Against this lie the objections, 1st that it unnecessarily treats תלפיות as a composite word; 2d, that an armory would be more naturally described as a "hang-weapons" than a "hang-edges;" 3d, that the figure before us is not that of an armory, but of a building with shields hung on its exterior; 4th, that any etymological connection between the words תלפיות and תלוי in the two adjoining clauses is improbable, as it would destroy the charm of the studied homœophony. There are two other passages of Scripture in which we may trace some allusion to this tower, Mic. iv. 8; Isa. v. 2." THRUPP.]

* [NOYES thinks that the bride herself, in respect to her general charms, is here compared to a mountain of myrrh, *etc.*, to whom the lover says he will return as the antelope flies to the mountain.]

Digitized by Google

far less forced than explaining it of Lebanon, or generally of the region of Shulamith's home, for which she here expresses her desire (Umbreit, Vaih.), or of "Sion as the seat of the court" (Hitzig), or of Zion as a figure of the church (Hengstenb.), or of Moriah as the Temple-mountain which is here designated הַר הַמּוֹר (Ibn Esra, Jarchi). Comp. on v. 18 and vi. 2.

4. Continuation: vers. 7–11.

Ver. 7. **Thou art all fair, my dear, and there is not a blemish in thee.** Correctly Delitzsch: "This childlike disposition expressed ver. 6, makes her but the more lovely in the eyes of the king; he breaks out in the words, 'thou art all fair, my dear,' *etc.*, undoubtedly meaning that the beauty of her soul corresponds with her outward beauty—not with reference, therefore, to the charms of her bodily figure from her breast downward, which are more fully described subsequently vii. 2 ff." (Weiss.)—On the form of expression, particularly in *b*, comp. 2 Sam. xiv. 25; Eph. v. 27.

Ver. 8. **With me from Lebanon, my bride, with me from Lebanon thou shalt come.** Several of the advocates of the shepherd-hypothesis assume at these words a change of person and with it likewise a change of scene, either making the shepherd himself enter and speak all that follows to ver. 16 (so Böttcher, Ren.), or at least to ver. 8 (so Hitzig), or regarding all from this verse to v. 8 as a monologue of Shulamith, who herein relates the words previously spoken to her by her country lover (so Ewald, who accordingly imagines that the words: "Lo, here comes my lover, and says to me," or the like, have been dropped out before this verse). But an unprejudiced interpretation renders such artifices needless. Led by the wish of his beloved, expressed in ver. 6, to exchange her place amongst the jubilant guests for the quiet solitude of nature, Solomon recalls her descent from a simple shepherd's family in the mountain region of Northern Palestine, and hence he exultingly and in exaggerated expressions announces to her how instead of living in sterile mountain districts, and on barren rocky heights rendered insecure by wild beasts, she should henceforth make her home with him in the royal palace, and in the midst of its rich joys and blissful beauties, herself its loveliest flower, the most charming and spicy of its gardens (see especially vers. 12–15). The enthusiastic lover does not consider that in this he says nothing that is really agreeable to her, but actually contravenes her longing to escape into the open country from the close and sultry atmosphere of court life, any more than he concerns himself about the exaggerated character of his comparisons, *e. g.* of the mountains around Shunem with Lebanon, or of the "little foxes" in Shulamith's vineyards (ii. 15) with lions and panthers. Poetical exaggerations of this sort are besides quite accordant with his taste (comp. ver. 4 and especially vii. 5), and appear much less strange in him than the bold comparison of Zion or of Solomon's palace with the heights of Lebanon and Hermon (according to Hitzig, Böttch., Renan, *etc.*,) would sound in the mouth of a simple shepherd.—Besides תָּבוֹאִי "thou shalt come" shows that the speaker had a definite term in mind, to which Shulamith was to come from "Lebanon" as her previous residence (comp. Hitzig *in loc.*), and that consequently the idea of going up and down from one peak of Lebanon to another (Delitzsch) is not found in the passage.*—**Shalt journey from the top of Amana.** The "summit" or the "top" of Amana is without doubt the mountain by the river Amana mentioned 2 Kin. v. 12 K'ri, that is to say that peak of the Lebanon or more accurately the Antilibanus-range, in which this river Amana, the Chrysorrhoas of the Greeks or the Barada of the Arabs takes its rise. This peak, like the following Shenir and Hermon, stands of course by poetic license for the entire range. For the poet cannot have intended a contrast between the Lebanon in *a* and these names of mountains that follow, but "he only varies the names because one meant the same to him as another" (so correctly Hitzig, *versus* Delitzsch, Hengstenb., *etc.*).—**From the top of Shenir and Hermon.** According to Deut. iii. 9 Shenir was the Amoritish name for Hermon itself, which thereby appears to be designated as the "snow mountain" (according to Jarchi on that passage and the Targum on this). Still it is shown as well by the passage before us as by Ezek. xxvii. 5, 1 Chron. v. 23, that a distinction was commonly made between Shenir which lay further to the north and Hermon (now Jebel esh-Sheikh) the more southern of the principal peaks in the entire Hermon or Antilibanus range (comp. Robinson, *Palest.* II. p. 440 (edit. 1838), Berth. on 1 Chron. v. 23). As now Amana, where the Chrysorrhoas has its source, must be the peak lying farthest to the east or north-east, the enumeration of the three peaks or ridges belonging to Antilibanus evidently proceeds from the north-east to the south-west, or from the region of Baalbec to that of Hasbeya and Paneas (comp. Hitzig *in loc.*).—**From dens of lions, from mountains of panthers.** These expressions as belonging to the description and only alluding in a general way to the wild and inhospitable character of the region about Shulamith's home, are not to be pressed for the sake of obtaining any more special sense, particularly not so as with Köster, Böttcher, Hitzig, *etc.* to explain the lions of "the king of Israel and his magnates who have dragged the graceful roe Shulamith into his den!" Lions moreover must have had their haunts in the for-

* [This interpretation certainly assumes such extraordinary exaggerations as to cast suspicion upon its correctness. Noyes says: "Verses 8 and 9 seem to be introduced very abruptly, and their import in this connection is not very obvious. Döderlein and others suppose them to be an invitation to the bride to take an excursion with him, in order that they might admire together all that was grand and beautiful in scenery. Others suppose them to be an invitation to the maiden to come from a place of danger to a place of complete security in the arms of her lover." Good: "By this forcible appeal the royal speaker invites his beloved to his arms as to a place of safety; and encourages her to look towards him for security amidst any dangers, either actual or imaginary, of which she might be apprehensive." Burrowes: "These mountains thus beautiful but dangerous are put in contrast with the mountain of myrrh and the hill of frankincense. The beloved would have his spouse leave the former and seek his society in the retreats of the latter." The majority of English commentators adopt a similar view, though with some variety in the figurative or symbolic sense which they put upon the mountains in question.—Tr.]

Digitized by Google

ests of Lebanon, as well as in the reeds on the banks of the Jordan (Zech. xi. 3; Jer. xii. 5) and on Bashan (Deut. xxxiii. 22). And panthers (this is the meaning of נְמֵרִים, not leopards, which as is known, are only found in Africa) are still found in the region of Lebanon according to modern travellers. (BURCKHARDT, *Reisen in Syrien*, pp. 99, 66).

Ver. 9. **Thou hast ravished my heart, my sister, my bride.** This double designation of his beloved as sister and as bride is neither meant to indicate a peculiarly intimate nor pre-eminently chaste and pure relation of love. The thing here intended by it is the designation of a certain relationship. As Solomon's lawful wife Shulamith now, after the marriage has taken place, stands next to him as a sister to her brother.* She is not barely one of a number of wives (vi. 8) but a sisterly sharer of his royal rank and name. She is queen, as he is king, yes, a "prince's daughter," vii. 2, as he is a prince's son (correctly HITZIG and WEISSB.).—לִבַּבְתִּנִי not "thou robbest me of courage" (UMBR., MAGN.), nor "thou hast given me courage" (SYMM., SYR., EWALD, DÖPKE, BÖTTCHER, MEIER, WEISSB., *etc.*), but "thou hast *unhearted* me" (DELITZSCH) *i. e.* "robbed me of my heart, so that it is no more mine but thine," hast "enchanted me and made me wholly thine own."†—**With one of thy glances**; literally "with one from thy eyes," *i. e.* with a single one of the glances that proceed from them (HENGSTENB., HITZIG, *etc.*); for the masc. בְּאַחַד of the K'thibh, which is certainly to be retained, cannot refer to one of the two eyes (עַיִן is never masc.), but only to one thing which comes forth from the eyes, an effect proceeding from them.‡—**With one chain of thy necklace.** The representation is ideal and hyperbolical as in the preceding verse. It proceeds in rapturous exaggerations as well here where it paints in detail, as before where it dealt in pompous and grandiloquent expressions. But to be sure, in the matter of love, it always remains true: small causes often produce great effects!—עֲנָק not "ringlet, lock of the front hair hanging down on the neck" (HITZIG), but neckchain, or ornament (comp. the plur.: Prov. i. 9; Judg. viii. 16). צַוְּרֹנִים, since it is plural, can neither mean "neck" (SEPT., VULG., HITZIG, *etc.*) nor be a diminutive of endearment, "tiny neck" (GESENIUS, EWALD, HEILIGST., *etc.*). It must rather denote something suspended about the neck, a necklace or jewelry for the neck,* and עֲנָק a single piece or constituent of it. What had enchanted the king was of course not the elegance or ingenious workmanship of this ornament itself, but that Shulamith's neck looked so charmingly in it. Comp. above on i. 10.

Ver. 10. **How fair is thy love, my sister, my bride.** דּוֹדִים here again, not "breasts" (SEPT., VULG., LUTHER), but "caresses, manifestations of love," as i. 2. Comp. generally i. 2, 3. Solomon here gives back to his beloved with larger measure, what she had there declared of him when absent.

Ver. 11. **Liquid honey thy lips distil, my bride; honey and milk are under thy tongue.** As in the preceding verse, which like the present consists of three clauses, the first two members refer to one and the same subject, so these two clauses aim to depict but one attribute or one characteristic of Shulamith, *viz.*, her lovely discourse, how sweetly she talked. For it is to this that the figures of lips and tongue point, comp. on the one hand Prov. v. 3; vi. 24; vii. 5; xvi. 24; and on the other Ps. lv. 22; lxvi. 17; x. 7; PINDAR, *Nem.* iii. 134; THEOCRIT. *Id.* viii. 82 ff.; xx. 26 ff. The fragrant spittle of the kissing mouth can scarcely be intended (vs. DÖPKE, MAGN., WEISSB.), in spite of Arabic and classic parallels, that might be adduced (the *saliva oris osculantis* HORAT. *Od.* I. 13, 16; CATULL. 99, 2, *etc.*). For the parallels ii. 14, v. 13, 16, likewise refer to the loveliness of discourse, not to the sweetness of kisses.—**And the fragrance of thy garments is like the fragrance of Lebanon.** As is shown by the parallel, Hos. xiv. 7, the Lebanon of this passage is not to be converted into לְבוֹנָה "frankincense" as DÖPKE imagines, on account of the "*sicut odor thuris*" of the VULG. (which probably arose from misunderstanding the ὡς ὀσμὴ Λιβάνου of the SEPT.). Modern travellers testify (SCHULZ. *Leit. d. Allerh.*, Th. V. p. 459; ZELLER, *Bibl. Wörterbuch für d. Christl. Volk* II. p. 42) that the cedar groves of Lebanon diffuse a strong balsamic odor. Isaac also commends the scent of his son Esau's garments (Gen. xxvii. 27); and so Ps. xlv. 9 praises the garments of a king celebrating his marriage, which were perfumed with myrrh, aloes and cassia.

5. CONTINUATION. Vers. 12–15.

Ver. 12. **A garden locked is my sister, my bride; a spring locked, a fountain sealed.** If instead of גַּל in *b* we were with about 50 Heb. Mss. of KENNICOTT, the SEPT., VULG., SYR., *etc.*,† to read

* [PATRICK: "Sister is only a word of tenderness and endearment used by husbands to their wives; as appears by the book of Tobit vii. 16; viii. 4, 7." NOYES, with less cogency, compares Tibul. iii. 1, 26. THRUPP is consequently not warranted in saying: "The union of the two appellations is of itself an almost decisive objection against all literal interpretation of the Song. When it is urged by the literalists that the term sister is merely used as an expression of endearment, it may be at once replied that that is the very last term which in chaste love a bridegroom would ever think of applying to his bride."]

† [WORDSWORTH obtains substantially the same sense by a rendering precisely the opposite: "Lit.: *Thou hast be-hearted me.* It implies the answering of heart to heart; the passing of one heart into another, so as to be united with it and fill it."]

‡ (WILLIAMS, who remarks that "the K'ri and many MSS. read אחת fem. to agree with עַיִן," endeavors to account for the singularity of the expression so understood in the following manner: "Supposing the royal bridegroom to have had a profile or side view of his bride in the present instance, only one eye or one side of her necklace would be observable; yet this charms and overpowers him. TERTULLIAN mentions a custom in the East of women unveiling only one eye in conversation, while they keep the other covered; and NIEBUHR mentions a like custom in some parts of Arabia. *Trav. in Arab.* I. p. 262."]

* [Whether this conclusion be correct or not, the argument here urged in its favor is plainly not decisive; for the plural of צַוָּאר, the ordinary word for "neck," is more frequently used in a singular than a plural sense.—TR.]

† [So THRUPP: The received Hebrew text here gives not גַּן but גַּל which our E. V. renders "a spring." But the word never occurs elsewhere in this sense; nor is it indeed, in the singular, applied to aught but a heap of stones.]

Digitized by Google

גַּן again, the comparison with the garden, being immediately repeated, would appear to be the main and prominent thought. But it is evidently more suitable that the figure of the spring, which is not carried out any further in what immediately follows, should be twice repeated, in order that it may not be too abrupt. The change of the unusual גַּל (which means spring, fountain, as appears from Josh. xv. 19; Judg. i. 15; comp. English *well*, of which the German "Wellen" (*waves*) is the plural) into גַּן, which had been used just before, would also be easier to explain, than a conversion of the latter into the former expression. The garden and the spring being locked up and sealed, naturally indicates that the access is open only to the owner and possessor himself. Comp. ver. 16, where Shulamith designates her hidden charms first as her own garden, then as Solomon's; also Prov. v. 15–18, where the figure of a spring is likewise applied to the natural relation between a wife and her wedded lord, so that she is represented by a fountain absolutely inaccessible to all men except her husband, and the right of the latter freely to enjoy and to refresh himself with the waters of this spring is clearly presupposed.* A previous coyness of Shulamith toward her lover (HITZIG, VAIH., *etc.*) is not at all the thing intended.

Vers. 13, 14. A more minute description of the garden, *i. e.*, of the charms of Shulamith, in so far as they may be represented by the choice plants and delicious fruits of a pleasure garden, accessible only to the king; an expansion therefore of 12 *a* (as 12 *b* is more fully unfolded in ver. 15). **Thy plants are an orchard of pomegranates.** שֶׁלַח means here as in Ex. xxxi. 5, not a plantation (HENGSTENB.), but a single plant, literally a shoot, sprout (comp. שֶׁלַח Ps. lxxx. 12; Jer. xvii. 8; Ezek. xvii. 6, 7). By this figurative expression are denoted the charms, the ravishing beauties of the beloved in general, not specially her limbs (HITZIG), or the fragrance of her unguents (WEISSB.). A particular explanation of the individual products of the garden is, on the whole, impossible, and it leads to what is at variance with good taste. רִמּוֹנִים pomegranates, *i. e.*, the trees, not their fruit (DÖPKE, EWALD, WEISSB.); for the fruit is mentioned afterwards.—On the different opinions respecting the etymology of פַּרְדֵּס, comp. the Introduction, § 8 Rem. 2.—**With most excellent fruit**; lit., "with fruit of excellencies" (מְגָדִים as vii. 14). The fruit of the pomegranate trees before mentioned may very well be intended; עִם *with* does not necessarily, as is shown by i. 11, introduce something entirely new and of a different sort (vs. WEISSB.)—**Cyprus flowers with nards.** As already remarked on i. 12, 14, the cyprus flower or alhenna was the only one of these plants, which was also cultivated in Palestine. The nard grass, grown only in India, is therefore simply added here for the sake of the delightfully fragrant unguent obtained from it, as in the following verse incense, calamus, cinnamon, and probably also saffron are exotic plants known to the Hebrews only from their aromatic products. The description accordingly loses itself here again in rapturous exaggerations and improbabilities in natural history, which however at the same time bear witness to an extensive knowledge of nature (comp. Introduc. § 8, Rem. 1).—**Nard and crocus, calamus and cinnamon.** כַּרְכֹּם, CHALD. כּוּרְכְּמָא, SEPT. κρόκος (comp. Sanskrit, *kunkuma*) is the saffron flower, (Crocus sativus) indigenous in India, but introduced also into Egypt and Asia Minor, and consequently perhaps also into Palestine. A water was prepared from it for smelling bottles, with a pungent but agreeable odor, which was a great favorite in antiquity; comp. WINER *R. W. B.* Art. "Safran."—קָנֶה, SEPT. κάλαμος, is, according to Jer. vi. 20; Isa. xliii. 24; Ezek. xxvii. 19, an article of trade brought from Arabia Felix, sweet cane, calamus. The calamus (juncus odoratus, PLIN. XII. 22; XXI. 18) which according to THEOPHRASTUS, PLINY and STRABO, grew in Coelesyria and by the lake of Gennesaret, was of an inferior and less valuable sort.—קִנָּמוֹן a Semitic name, as it would appear (lit. "the reed," or the "rolled together," from קָנֶה—קָנַם), in case it is not of Indian origin, and connected with the Malay *kainamanis* (so RÖDIGER, *Additamenta ad Thesaur.*, p. 111) signifies cinnamon, which, according to HERODOT. III. 111 came through Arabia from the remotest south, that is, probably from Ceylon.—**With every variety of incense woods**, *i. e.*, with every species of wood, which yields a fragrant gum of the nature of frankincense, or when pulverized is used as "aromatic dust," or as a powder to be sprinkled for fumigation. In opposition to the reading עֲצֵי לְבָנוֹן (SEPT., VELTH., DÖPKE), see HITZIG *in loc.*—**Myrrh and aloes, with all the chief spices.** For myrrh comp. on i. 13; and for aloes (אֲהָלוֹת or אֲהָלִים, as Prov. vii. 17.; Num. xxiv. 6; Gr. ἀγάλλοχον, Sanskr. *aguru, aghil*) see WINER, *R. W. B.*—Under "all the chief (lit., all heads of) aromatic plants," balsams or spices (בְּשָׂמִים a general expression, as in Ex. xxx. 23; Esth. ii. 12), in addition to the substances already named, cassia is especially to be regarded as included. For according to Ex. xxx. 23 ff., this particular aromatic product was mingled

* [FRY imagines that this and the following verses do not "contain comparisons of the bride, but are descriptive of the residence prepared for her reception." He translates: "A garden is enclosed, my sister espoused," *etc.* MAUNDRELL, in his *Journey* says: "About the distance of one hundred and forty paces from these pools [*i. e.* of Solomon] is the fountain from which they principally derive their waters. This the friars told us was the sealed fountain, to which the holy spouse is compared, Cant. iv. 12. And they pretend a tradition that King Solomon shut up these springs, and kept the door of them sealed with his signet, to preserve the waters for his own drinking in their natural freshness and purity. Nor was it difficult thus to secure them, they rising under ground, and having no avenue to them but a little hole like the mouth of a narrow well. These waters wind along through two rooms cut out of the solid rock, which are arched over with stone arches, very ancient, perhaps the work of Solomon himself. Below the pool runs down a narrow, rocky valley, inclosed on both sides with high mountains; this, they told us, was the enclosed garden alluded to in the same Song."]

Digitized by Google

with myrrh, calamus and cinnamon, in the holy anointing oil, and in Ps. xlv. 9 (8) it appears with myrrh and aloes among the precious spices, with which the garments of the royal bridegroom were perfumed.

Ver. 15. Further expansion of ver. 12 *b*.—**A garden spring** (art thou), **a well of living water.** Comp. Gen. xxvi. 19; Jér. ii. 13. By the "garden spring" (lit. spring of gardens) HITZIG understands the fountain of Siloah in particular—an assumption which is the more gratuitous, as the allusion to שִׁלֹחַ which he finds in שְׁלָחִים ver. 13, exists merely in the fancy of the overacute modern critic, in spite of Neh. iii. 15; Isa. viii. 6; Eccles. ii. 6, *etc.*—**And streams from Lebanon**, *i. e.*, water as fresh and delightfully refreshing as the gushing streams fed by the snows of Lebanon, Jer. xviii. 14. On the figure comp. besides Prov. v. 15, the Phenician inscription of Kition (No. 2) adduced by HITZIG, in which a husband calls his deceased wife "מבחי, *i. e.*, מַבֻּעַ חַיַּי, "the spring of my life."

6. THE COMPLETE UNION OF THE LOVERS, ver. 16, v. 1.—IBN EZRA, followed by EWALD and DELITZSCH, correctly puts the whole of ver. 16 into the mouth of Shulamith. The contrast of גַּנִּי *my garden* in *a* with לְגַנּוֹ *his garden* in *b* does not make in favor of two speakers, but simply brings out the thought that her garden is his, and therefore that she, with all she has and is, belongs to him; a delicately refined suggestion which is lost by dividing the verse between the lover and his beloved, as approved in recent times (DÖPKE, MAGN., BÖTTCH., HITZ., REN., *etc.*).

Ver. 16. **Awake, north wind, and come, O south.** Shulamith in her poetically excited frame summons just these two winds to blow upon her garden, because neither the east wind with its parching effects and its frequent storms (Gen. xli. 6; Isa. xxvii. 8), nor the rainy west wind (1 Kin. xviii. 44 f; Luke xii. 54) would be suitable in the connection; and yet two opposite winds must be named, as it is not a blowing off or blowing away that is intended, but causing the odors to flow forth and wafting them in all directions.* **That its spices may flow**, *i. e.*, that every thing in me, which pleases my lover, all my charms may show themselves to him in their full power and loveliness.—**Let my beloved come to his garden, and eat his excellent fruits.** The language here becomes plainer, and passes over into a solicitation to her lover to enjoy to the full her charms which he had been praising (for אָכַל "to eat" in this comp. Prov. xxx. 20.) Yet she expresses this wish not by a direct address to him, but by speaking of him in the third person—a token of her chaste, modest and bashful mind.—Chap. v. 1. **I come to my garden, my sister, my bride.** That Solomon is here the speaker, whilst full of rapture he sets himself to comply with his beloved's invitation and to devote himself entirely to her loving embrace incontestably appears from the correspondence of בָּאתִי with יָבֹא in *b* of the preceding verse, and of אָכַלְתִּי here with וְיֹאכַל there. These verbs, as well as אָרִיתִי (=לָקַטְתִּי "I pluck," Ex. xvi. 16) and שָׁתִיתִי are not to be taken as preterites: "I have come," *etc.*, (DEL., as the SEPT., VULG., LUTHER, *etc.*,) because the acme of love's enjoyment, to which both are tending, was by no means reached and exhausted by a single conjugal embrace, but strictly as present, as serving to state that which is in the very act of being performed.* Comp. דִּמִּיתִיךְ; i. 9, and numerous examples in EWALD, *Lehrb.*, § 135 *c*, [GREEN's *Heb. Gram.*, § 262, 2.]—**I pluck my myrrh . . . . . I eat my honey . . . . . I drink my wine.** A threefold declaration in different forms of his immediate readiness to enjoy the charms of his beloved, with a partial return to the figures in iv. 10, 11, 13.†—**Eat friends, drink and drink to repletion, O beloved.** Every other understanding of these closing verses seems inappropriate and forced but that already suggested, according to which they are an encouraging address of the bridegroom to the wedding guests, who remain behind at the table. Thus, *e. g.*, that of EWALD, that Shulamith describes in these words the way in which her distant lover, if she were with him and were celebrating her marriage with him, would remember his friends; the strange and burlesque idea of BÖTTCHER referred to above, p. 72; that, too, of EICHHORN, MAGNUS, HITZIG: that the words are an exhortation of the poet to the two lovers to enjoy their love and intoxicate themselves therewith; and the like views of others, according to which Solomon either encourages his beloved (UMBR., HENGSTENB., HAHN) or she him (WEISSB.) to the enjoyment of love. These latter views are based upon an untenable translation of דּוֹדִים by "love" as though it were the object of וְשִׁכְרוּ ("intoxicate yourselves with love") for דּוֹדִים with the *scriptio plena* is plur. of דּוֹד "beloved" (comp. on i. 2), and consequently Prov. vii. 18 (where it is דֹּדִים "caresses" with the *scriptio defectiva*) cannot decide for the present case. The SEPT., VULG., LUTHER, DÖPKE, VAIH., DEL., are substantially correct, the last of whom adds the just remark in explanation: "For each (of the guests) was to have his share in tasting the joy of this day."

* [BURROWES: "The east wind is, in Palestine, generally withering and tempestuous; the west wind brings from the sea clouds of rain, or dark, damp air; the north wind is cooling and refreshing, its power being broken by the mountain chain of Lebanon; the south wind, though hot, has its heat mitigated in the upland regions, and is never stormy. The north wind is called on to "arise," because it is more powerful and strong; the south wind to "come," as though it were the soft breathing zephyr. The north wind brought clear weather; the south wind was warm and moist. The bride here calls for the north wind, that thereby all clouds may be swept away and the sky cleared; and for the south wind that its genial influence might ripen the fruits of the garden and draw forth the fragrance of the flowers."]

* [There is no reference in the language here employed to any thing low and sensual, but to pure and elevated enjoyment in the society and converse of his charming bride. The passage is thus appropriately paraphrased by TAYLOR: "I already enjoy the pleasure of your company and conversation; these are as grateful to my mind as delicious food could be to my palate: I could not drink wine and milk with greater satisfaction." He also gives a like figurative turn to the last clause: "And you, my friends, partake the relish of those pleasures which you hear from the lips of my beloved, and of those elegancies which you behold in her deportment and address."—TR.]

† [But see דּוֹדִי vii. 13.—TR.]

Digitized by Google

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. That the action of the Canticles reaches its centre and acme in this act, and especially at the close of it, cannot be doubted upon an unprejudiced view of the whole. "The newly wedded bride is now in the arms of her husband and king. Their ardent mutual love is the joyous spectacle presented to a festive assembly, which is attached to the king by friendship and love. Every where the feeling suited to a wedding, enjoyment, and this enjoyment shared by loving sympathy. Arrived at the summit of love's mystery and moving there with holy purity the song here dies away amid the revelry of the guests." (DEL., p. 115.)

2. The recognition of the central and superior significance of this section is of necessity precluded upon the allegorical interpretation, because it fails to perceive the organic progress of the action in general, and supposes the union of the two lovers to have become complete long before this, (comp. above. p. 56) so as neither to require nor admit of increase. This *unio mystica*, this perfect union of Christ with His church or with the individual soul it consequently finds not at the conclusion merely, but already indicated at the very beginning of the present act in the "bed of Solomon," iii. 7, by which it is true many allegorists understand every different sort of thing, (*e.g.*, IBN EZRA, the land of Israel; the TARG. and in recent times again JO. LANGE, the temple; SANCTIUS, prayer; THEODORET, the Holy Scriptures; APONIUS, the cross of Christ; and OSIANDER, the free exercise of religion even!) But the majority find represented in it the communion of believers with Christ at the acme of its perfection, whether their particular explanation points to Christ Himself (AMBROSE), or they find symbolized in it the heart of the Christian believer in conformity with Eph. iii. 17 (COCCEI., *etc.*,) or the free access of believers to the throne of grace in this world and the next (JOH. MARCK.), or "the church militant on earth, in which many children are born to the Lord" (STARKE after many of the older writers, as GREGORY the Great, CASSIODOR., BEDA, CALOV., HEUNISCH, *etc.*), or "the intimate relation between the heavenly Solomon and the church" (HENGST.), or the "kingdom administered by Solomon, so far as its power is directed *ad extra*" (HAHN). In the case of the sedan or magnificent couch (אפריון iii. 9) this divergence of interpretations is repeated with a prevailing disposition to refer it to the *unio mystica*. For besides the holy of holies in the temple (TARG.), or the word of God (MERCER.), or the church (ZELTN.), or the human nature of Christ (AMBROS., ATHANAS., GREG., BEDA, ANSELM, JO. LANGE), it is particularly the work of redemption with the gracious results proceeding from it (SANCTIUS; similarly COCCEIUS, GROENEWEGEN, STARKE, *etc.*,) or as expressed by HENGSTENBERG: "the glory of those measures by which the heavenly Solomon brings the Gentile nations into His kingdom," that is supposed to be intended by this figure of the sedan.* It is the same with iii. 11, where the "day of Solomon's marriage" according to STARKE signifies three things: 1. The day of salvation, when a sinner yields to converting grace, and is united to Christ by faith; 2. The day of the resurrection of the just, when Christ will make them partakers of the blessedness of the world to come. 3. The time when the Jewish people, who have long rejected Him shall crown Him in faith and publicly acknowledge Him as their bridegroom—an explanation with which most of the older and the later writers (even HENGSTENB., HAHN, *etc.*,) substantially agree, especially in so far that nearly all of them understand by the mother of Solomon the church of the Old Testament or the people of Israel, and by the crown with which she adorns her son the entire body of converted souls, which are an ornament and an honor to the Messiah,* comp. Phil. iv. 1; 1 Thes. ii. 19, *etc.*

This method of putting every possible interpretation upon every particular thing, and thus attaining an extravagant exuberance of multifarious significations, is also followed, of course, by the allegorists in the enthusiastic description of the beauty of the bride in iv. 1 ff. The hair of Shulamith compared with the flock of goats is made to signify either the entire body of believers or the weak and despised members of the church, or on the contrary, those who strive after a higher measure of perfection, the prelates of the church who have a keen eye like the goats, seek their food on the summits, eat what is green and chew the cud, and have parted hoofs and horns, wherewith to fight the heretics! The teeth of the beloved are prelates who feed upon the Scriptures, or teachers who attack the heretics; the lips either the preachers of God's word or confessions of faith of the church; the neck the Holy Scriptures or the steadfastness and assured hope of believers; the breasts compared with twin roes either the law and the gospel, or the Old and New Testament, or the Jews and Gentiles, or the eastern and western church, or baptism and the Lord's Supper as the two sacraments of the

* [WEISS expounds it of the holy of holies in Solomon's temple; the GENEVA version of "The temple which Solomon made;" THRUPP and WORDSWORTH, of the cross of Christ: The WESTMINSTER ANNOTATIONS, MOODY STUART and B. M. SMITH, of the person of Christ; ADELAIDE NEWTON, of the church; AINSWORTH, of Christ and His church; SCOTT, the everlasting covenant which Christ has meditated in our behalf; PATRICK, the preaching of the gospel by which the church is carried triumphantly through the world; WILLIAMS, the gospel in its onward progress; FRY and BURROWES, that conveyance, or those methods of divine grace by which the believer is carried onward toward heaven; GILL and HENRY, hesitate between the human nature of Christ, the church, the gospel, and the plan of salvation. BURROWES says: "It seems no part of the mind of the Spirit that we should take this description to pieces and try to allegorize the several parts." THRUPP also conveniently declines to carry the allegory through in all its details; "It is not necessary to suppose that any significance is intended in the assignment of separate materials to particular parts of the vehicle." SCOTT, however, is ready with distinct meanings for the "pillars of silver," the "bottom of gold," and the "covering of purple." And THRUPP himself insists that every separate feature of the bride in iv. 1–7 "must have its own distinct allegorical import. The comparisons would be as extravagant on the allegorical as on the literal interpretation, if the former were not to be carried out into details; and in fact that interpretation is virtually literal which refuses to see any allegory except in the general words 'Thou art fair.'"]

* Besides this prevalent form of the spiritual interpretation of iii. 11 there are various others of a more trifling character, especially among the older exegetes of whom, *e. g.*, BEDA and ANSELM expound the wedding day of Christ's conception and birth; HONORIUS V. AUTUN and BERNARD of the death and resurrection of the Lord (and then the "crown" naturally

Digitized by Google

church!* The locking up of the garden iv. 12 ff. denotes the strong protection with which God surrounds His church as with a wall of fire; the sealing is the gracious operations of the Holy Spirit on the church to enlighten and preserve it, Eph. iv. 30. The blowing of the north and south wind, iv. 16 also signifies the Holy Spirit in the varied operations of His grace, purifying, quickening, comforting, rendering fruitful, *etc.;* and the "coming of the bridegroom into his garden" (v. 1) according to the chronological expositors denotes the dawn of some new epoch in church history, *e. g.*, according to COCCEIUS the times immediately succeeding CONSTANTINE the Great; according to HEUNISCH the ante-reformation period from the time of the great Schism (1378); according to CORN. A LAPIDE the incipient old age of the church, *etc.*, but according to the greater number the particular times when Christ enters with the heavenly blessings of His grace into the hearts of believers (Rev. iii. 20; John xiv. 23), or the threefold advent of the Redeemer: 1. In the form of a servant to found His church. 2. His invisible coming by His Holy Spirit to every individual of His people. 3. His eschatological coming at the judgment and the consummation. Compare generally the multitude of old interpretations of this sort collected by STARKE on this section; also WILKENS, FRAY LUIS DE LEON, p. 207, 215, and DURSCH, *Symbolik der Christlichen Religion*, Vol. II. (*Tübing.*, 1859),) *passim.*

3. Against such excesses and capricious trifling there is no protection but in that historical exegesis, which on the basis of the meaning of the words impartially ascertained endeavors, it is true, to point out the relations in which this action stands to the mysteries of revelation and redemption, and so to make application of its contents to the matters of the Christian life, but conscientiously refrains from all seeking or chasing after any direct spiritual and practical interpretation of individual passages, much less of individual words. To such an exegesis there appear to be chiefly three particulars of especial consequence in that stage of the action which is represented in this act: the elevation of the bride from a low condition to royal dignity and glory; her wondrous beauty as the ground of this elevation; and her chaste and humble mind which impels her to belong only to her lover and to live for him alone.

a. The simple country maiden from the tribe of Issachar is raised to be queen of all Israel, conducted in Solomon's stately couch with a brilliant military escort, welcomed by the women of Jerusalem with pride and admiration, brought for her marriage to his splendid palace in Zion by Solomon, the most famous prince of his time. Here full of rapture he declares to her that he loves and admires her more than all beside, that she has completely won and captivated him, so that his heart belongs to her alone, and that she is henceforth to exchange her humble surroundings and her country home for his royal palace and its rich enjoyments and brilliant pleasures (see especially iv. 8, 9). In like manner Christ, who is a greater than Solomon, who is King of all kings, and Lord of all lords, has exalted His church from misery and a low estate to a participation in His divine glory; He has made the despised and forsaken "His sister and bride," a joint-heir of His eternal glory in heaven, has received her into His kingdom, into His heavenly Father's house and there prepared a place for her, which she shall never be willing to exchange for her former abode in a remote and foreign land, in the wilderness of a sinful, earthly life. For the infinite superiority of that exaltation which the church of the Lord has experienced above that of Shulamith, and which every penitent and believing soul in it still experiences day by day, is shown in this that the shepherd girl from northern Palestine might with good reason look wistfully back to her poverty from Solomon's palace, that her desire to return from the sultry life of the court to the fresh cool mountain air of her home was but too well justified, whilst the soul which has been translated out of the wretchedness of a sinful worldly life into the blessed communion of God's grace, has no occasion nor right to be dissatisfied with its new home, but on the contrary has gained unmingled joy, delight and imperishable glory instead of its former condition of unhappy bondage and darkness.

b. The cause of Shulamith's elevation to be queen of her people lay in her wonderful beauty, which throws the king into such an ecstasy that he analyzes it with the utmost detail in order that he may adduce the finest objects of nature, which his realm affords, to set forth her charms; yes, that he represents one single glance of her eyes, one chain from the ornaments of her neck as possessed of the power to chain him to her completely. So also it is the beauty and god-like dignity, originally belonging to human nature, obscured indeed by sin, but not completely and for ever destroyed, which brought the Lord down to our earth and made Him our Redeemer, the royal bridegroom and loving husband of His church. But there is this difference between the earthly Solomon and his celestial antitype, that the latter

becomes either the crown of thorns, or the crown of glory belonging to His resurrection and exaltation), whilst chronological expositors as REINHARD, HEUNISCH, *etc.*, connect the wedding day with the epoch of CONSTANTINE the Great, or the conversion of the heathen in a body by the church, and Catholics like CORNELIUS A LAPIDE and CALMET explain the "mother" of Solomon of the Virgin Mary."

* [The two breasts are further explained in the notes of the DOWAY version to mean the love of God and the love of our neighbor; in the GENEVA, knowledge and zeal; by MOODY STUART and M. B. SMITH, faith and love; PATRICK, the preachers respectively among Jewish Christians and among the Gentiles; AINSWORTH, the loving affection, wholesome doctrines, sweet consolations and gracious beneficence of the church; SCOTT, the believer's simplicity of affection for Christ and the delight which Christ reciprocally takes in him; THRUPP, WEISS and WORDSWORTH, the fountains of nourishment whence is drawn the milk of pure and sound doctrine; while GILL allows a choice between ministers of the gospel, the two Testaments, the two Sacraments and the two great commandments of the law. BURROWES, whom none can suspect of an indisposition to allegorise, has the good taste to revolt at such mangling of inspired emblems. He says, p. 359, "In the comparison of the foregoing verses the thing to be illustrated is the general beauty of the pious soul in the eyes of Jesus. Losing sight of this most commentators have marred the passage by separating these emblems from one another, and appropriating them to other uses than the one intended by the Holy Spirit. What would be thought of a person who under the plea of heightening the effect of a picture by a great artist, should cut out the several figures, the trees, the waters, the tinted clouds, and exhibit them apart in every imaginable variety of light and position? This would show something more than want of judgment. No argument would be necessary to make us feel that such was never the mind of the artist. The common method of expounding this and the other kindred passages in the Song, seems no less unreasonable."]

Digitized by Google

must restore the partially destroyed and hideously distorted beauty of His beloved before He can raise her to sit with Him on His throne; He must in order to effect this restoration endure the direst sufferings; He must redeem the poor captive from the prince of this world by the ransom of His own precious blood; and afterwards, too, He must with much trouble and pains seek to retain her whom He has dearly purchased in the way of righteousness and truth and preserve her from falling back again into the defilement of sin. The heavenly Solomon can never, during the course of this present world, attain to a really pure and undisturbed joy in His bride. He has quite too much to do in cleansing her ever anew with the washing of water by the word in order to present her to Himself holy and without blemish, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing (Eph. v. 26, 27). The heavenly bridegroom of souls can neither sing to His church as a whole, nor to its individual members such a praise of her beauty as was sung by Shulamith's husband, culminating in the encomium, "Thou art all fair, my dear, and there is not a blemish in thee," iv. 7. He has, on the contrary, but too abundant occasion to speak to her in the tone adopted in the 16th chapter of the prophet Ezekiel. He must too often hold up before her not only the wretchedness of her birth and the misery of the first days of her childhood, but also the gross unfaithfulness and scandalous defilement of the flesh and spirit, of which, though His elect and His beloved, she has since made herself guilty. And He must all the more postpone her entrance upon the full enjoyment of His blessed society and His heavenly benefits until the future state, for the reason that she is previously lacking in many respects in another virtue which is most of all commended in Shulamith, her historical type. This is:

c. The chaste and humble mind, which the beloved of the earthly Solomon still preserved even after her elevation to regal dignity and glory, that child-like, pure and obedient heart which she brings to her husband, and in virtue of which she will belong only to him and offer the sweet-scented flowers and delightful fruit of her garden to him for his exclusive enjoyment. On the ground of this most sterling of all the qualities of his beloved, this crown of her virtues, Solomon celebrates on the very day of his marriage, his perfect union with her; the locked garden, the bolted and sealed fountain is opened to him for his comfort and refreshment.—The Church, as the bride of the Lord, remains a mere bride so long as she has to suffer and to fight here below, because she does not remain a locked garden and a sealed fountain, to the extent that this could be affirmed of her Old Testament type; because, on the contrary, she too often admits the seductive and defiling powers of sin and of the world to the sanctuary of her virginity, and allows them to desecrate the temple of her heart. Not until the end of days will her perfect union with the heavenly bridegroom be consummated, when she has suffered and contended to the full, and the great mystery, of which Paul writes, Eph. v. 32, has been fulfilled by the final and visible coming of her beloved. Until then it is only individual souls in the midst of her, that band of His faithful and elect, who are truly known to the Lord alone (2 Tim. ii. 19; Rom. viii. 28 ff.), whom He raises to the blessed height of a most intimate communion with Himself, and by the outpouring of His love in their hearts makes them partakers of the full blessings of His heavenly grace. This is that invisible communion of saints, which, as the true salt of the earth and light of the world, forms the real soul of Christendom, the genuine realization of the idea of the Church; which, as the true Bride of the Lamb, day by day with longing hearts unites in the supplication of the Spirit: "Come, Lord Jesus," Rev. xxii. 17; which, as the entire body of the wise virgins (Matth. xxv. 10) with loins girded and lamps burning (Luke xii. 35) waits and watches until He comes "that is holy and that is true, that openeth and no man shutteth; and shutteth and no man openeth" (Rev. iii. 7): which shall therefore one day in glorious reality and with never-ending joy experience the fulfilment of that desire which bids them sigh and cry here below:

Oh! come, do come, Thou Sun,
And bring us every one
To endless joy and light,
Thy halls of pure delight.

Digitized by Google

FOURTH SONG.

Shulamith's longing for her home again awakened.

CHAP. V. 2—VIII. 4.

FIRST SCENE:

SHULAMITH AND THE DAUGHTERS OF JERUSALEM.

(CHAP. V. 2—VI. 3.)

SHULAMITH (relating a dream).

2 I[1] was sleeping, but my heart was waking[2]—
Hark![3] my beloved is knocking:
'Open[4] to me, my sister,
my dear, my dove, my perfect;[5]
for[6] my head is filled with dew,
my locks with drops of the night!'
3 "I[7] have taken off my dress,
how shall I put it on?
I have washed my feet,
how[8] shall I soil them?"—
4 My[9] beloved extended his hand through the window,[10]
and I was inwardly excited[11] for him.
5 Up I rose to open to my beloved,
and my hands dropped with myrrh,
and my fingers with liquid myrrh,
upon the handle of the bolt.
6 I opened to my beloved,
and my beloved had turned[12] away, was gone;

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

1 [WICL., MAT.: The voice of the Church.]

2 The unmistakably close connection of these words with what follows "Hark! my beloved knocking!" gives to both the participles יְשֵׁנָה and עֵר the sense of imperfects. HITZIG correctly says: "The connection makes the two partic. as well as דּוֹפֵק express the relative past (comp. Jer. xxxviii. 26; Ex. v. 8); and this first part of the verse is therefore—בַּחֲלוֹמִי Gen. xli. 17."

3 Lit. "The sound of my beloved knocking," *etc.* Comp. ii. 8. דּוֹפֵק is not in apposition to דּוֹדִי, but the predicate, and for this reason is without the article; comp. Gen. iii. 8 [see GREEN's *Chrestom.*, p. 95, on this passage]. HITZIG correctly: "קוֹל is just the knocking, and is known to be קוֹל דּוֹדָה by the accompanying words."

4 [MAT.: Christ to the Church.]

5 [COV., MAT., CRAN., BISH.: darling. GENEV., ENG. VER.: undefiled.]

6 ·שֶׁ before רֹאשִׁי assigns the reason as אֲשֶׁר Eccles. vi. 12, or as כִּי Cant. ii. 11.

7 [MAT.: The voice of the spousess.]

8 The prolonged form אֵיכָכָה instead of אֵיךְ or אֵיכָה serves to make the question more emphatic, like our "How could I....? How can you ask me to.....?"

9 [MAT.: The voice of the Church speaking of Christ.]

10 [WICL., MAT.: hole. GENEV., ENG. VER.: hole of the door.]

11 [GENEV.: Mine heart was affectioned toward him. Marg. as ENG. VER.: my bowels were moved.]

12 חמק cognate with חנק "to embrace" is substantially synonymous with סבב "to turn;" comp. the Hith. in the sense of "turning and forsaking," Jer. xxxi. 22, as well as the substantive חַמּוּקִים "that which is turned or rounded," vii. 2 below. "He had turned away" is now strengthened by adding the synonyme עָבַר to express his total disappearance. SYMMACHUS correctly: ἀπονεύσας ἀπῆλθε, and still better the VULG.: "*at ille declinaverat atque transierat;*" for the pluperfect sense of the verbs is demanded by the context.

Digitized by Google

my soul failed,[1] when he spoke;[2]
I sought him but I did not find him,
I called him but he answered me not.
7 Found[3] me then the watchmen, who go around in the city;
they struck me, wounded me,
took my veil[4] off from me,
the watchmen of the walls.
8 I[5] adjure you, ye daughters of Jerusalem,
if ye find my beloved—
what shall ye tell him?
"that I am sick of love."

Daughters of Jerusalem.

9 What[6] is thy beloved more than (any other) beloved,[7]
thou fairest among women?
What is thy beloved more than (any other) beloved,
that thou dost adjure us thus?

Shulamith.

10 My[8] beloved is white and ruddy,
distinguished above ten thousand.
11 His head is pure gold,
his locks are hill upon hill,[9]
black as a raven.[10]
12 His eyes like doves by brooks of water,
bathing in milk, sitting on fulness.[11]
13 His cheeks like a bed of balm,
towers of spice plants;[12]
his lips lilies,
dropping liquid myrrh.
14 His hands golden rods,
encased in turquoises;[13]
his body a figure of ivory,
veiled with sapphires.

[1] Comp. Gen. xliii. 8: יָצָא לֵב. [Cov., Mat.: Now like as aforetime, when he spake, my heart could not refrain. Wicl., Dow.: melted. Burrowes: sunk in consequence of what he had said. Noyes, better: I was not in my senses while he spake.]

[2] Others read instead of בְּדַבְּרוֹ, בְּדָבְרוֹ and either explain this from the Arabic as equivalent to בְּעָבְרוֹ "at his going away, at his departure" (Ew., *etc.*) or (comparing the Arab. *dabra*—אַחֲרָיו "behind him," (Hitz.) with which Umbreit's reference of בְּדָבְרוֹ to a verb דָּבַר "to follow" ("I went out to follow him") substantially agrees. But all these explanations, as well as that of Weissbach, according to which we should read בִּדְבָרוֹ "on his account, for his sake," lack the requisite confirmation in point of language.

[3] [Mat.: The Church complaineth of her persecutors.]

[4] [Wicl.: mantle. Cov., Mat.: garment. Cran., Bish.: kerchief. Dow.: cloak.]

[5] [Mat.: The spousess speaketh to her companions.]

[6] [Wicl.: The voice of friends saith to the Church. Which is thy lemman (lover) of the loved? Mat.: The voice of the Synagogue. Who is thy love above other lovers—or what can thy love do more than other loves?]

[7] מִדּוֹד beyond any one who is a beloved, *i. e.*, more excellent than any other. דּוֹד here simply states the idea in a general form, and מִן is comparative, expressing the superiority of one thing above another, as in 10 *b*.

[8] [Wicl.: The voice of the Church of Christ saith to the friends. Mat.: The Church answering of Christ.]

[9] [Wicl.: as bunches of palms. Dow.: as the branches of palm trees. Genev.: curled. Eng. Ver.: bushy. Thrupp in imitation of the reduplicated form in Hebrew: flow flowingly.]

[10] [Cov., Mat.: brown as the evening.]

[11] [Cov., Mat.: remaining in a plenteous place. Cran., Bish.: set like pearls in gold. Genev.: remain by the full vessels. Dow.: sit beside the most full streams. Eng. Ver.: fitly set; Marg.: sitting in fulness, that is, fitly placed and set as a precious stone in the foil of a ring.]

[12] [Cov., Mat., Cran., Bish.: His cheeks are like a garden bed wherein the apothecaries plant all manner of sweet things.]

[13] [Cov., Mat.: His hands are full of gold rings and precious stones; his body is like the pure ivory, decked over with sapphires. Cran., Bish.: his hands are like gold rings having enclosed the pleasant stone of Tharsis. Dow.: his hands wrought round of gold, full of hyacinths. Genev.: his hands as rings of gold set with the chrysolite.]

Digitized by Google

15 His legs columns of white marble
set on bases of pure gold;
his aspect like Lebanon,
choice[1] as the cedars.
16 His palate[2] is sweets,[3]
and he is altogether precious.[4]
This is my beloved, and this[5] my friend,
ye daughters of Jerusalem.

DAUGHTERS OF JERUSALEM.

VI. 1 Whither[6] has thy beloved gone,
thou fairest among women?
whither has thy beloved turned,
that we may seek him with thee?

SHULAMITH

2 My[7] beloved has gone down to his garden,
to the beds of balm[8],
to feed[9] in the gardens
and to gather lilies.[10]
3 I am my beloved's and my beloved is mine,
who feeds among the lilies.

SECOND SCENE:

SOLOMON TO THE SAME AS BEFORE.

(CHAP. VI. 4.—VII. 6.)

SOLOMON.

4 Fair[11] art thou, my dear, as Tirzah,
comely as Jerusalem, terrible[12] as bannered[13] hosts,

1 בָּחוּר "chosen, excellent" (not "young man," as TARG., MAGN., EW., BÖTTCH. have it) is evidently intended to indicate the pre-eminence of the cedars above all other trees, their surpassing height and stately form. Comp. דָּגוּל ver. 10 above, which is substantially synonymous, as well as the expressions מִבְחַר אֲרָזִים Jer. xxii. 7, and מִבְחוֹר בְּרֹשִׁים (together with קוֹמַת אֲרָזִים) 2 Kings xix. 23. This word moreover belongs to מַרְאֵהוּ as its predicate; for it is too remote to refer it to the suffix attached to this word, or to a new subject derived from it (HITZ.).

2 [COV., MAT., DOW.: his throat. CRAN., BISH.: the words of his mouth. GENEV., ENG. VER.: his mouth; Marg.: palate.]

3 On the plur. מַמְתַקִּים "sweetnesses" see EW. *Lehrb.* §179, *a* [GREEN'S *Heb. Gram.* §201, 1, *a* and *c*].

4 מַחֲמַדִּים lit. "preciousnesses, desirable things;" comp. Joel iv. 5; Hos. ix. 16; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 19.

5 On the repeated זֶה comp. Gen. iii. 15.

6 [WICL.: The voice of holy souls, of the church. MAT.: The voice of the synagogue speaking to the church.]

7 [WICL., MAT.: The voice of the church.]

8 In regard to עֲרוּגוֹת בֹּשֶׂם comp. on v. 13 above.

9 [COV., MAT., CRAN., BISH.: that he may refresh himself.]

10 [THRUPP: Note in the Hebrew of this verse not only the rhyme between בַּגַּנִּים and שׁוֹשַׁנִּים, but also the resemblance in sound between לַעֲרוּגוֹת and לִרְעוֹת. COV., MAT.: flowers. CRAN.: roses.]

11 [WICL., MAT.: The voice of Christ to the church. WICL.: Fair thou art, my love, sweet and fair as Jerusalem. COV., MAT.: Thou art pleasant, O my love, even as loveliness itself; thou art fair as Jerusalem, glorious as an army of men with their banners.]

12 [GOOD, PERCY, TAYLOR, THRUPP: dazzling.]

13 נִדְגָּלוֹת lit., provided with a דֶּגֶל banner, gathered about a standard (comp. Num. i. 52; ii. 2; Ps. xx. 6); not, "distinguished, select," as WEISSB. misled by the affinity between this expression and דָּגוּל v. 10 supposes. The fem. נִדְגָּלוֹת is not to be explained by a מַחֲנוֹת understood (IBN EZRA), but it "expresses the idea of a collective, as in אֹרְחָה and גּוֹלָה" (HITZ.).

Digitized by Google

5 Turn away thine eyes from[1] me,
for they have taken me by storm.[2]
Thy hair is as a flock of goats,
reposing on Gilead.
6 Thy teeth as a flock of sheep,[3]
that go up from the washing,
all of which have twins,
and there is not a bereaved one among them.
7 Like a piece of pomegranate thy cheek
from behind thy veil.—
8 There are sixty queens
and eighty concubines
and virgins without number.
9 My dove, my perfect is one,[4]
the only one[5] of her mother,
the choice[6] one of her that bare her.
Daughters saw her and called her blessed,
queens and concubines and they praised her:
10 "Who[7] is this, that looks forth like the dawn,
fair as the moon, pure as the sun,
terrible as bannered hosts?"[8]

SHULAMITH.

11 To[9] the nut[10] garden I went down,
to look at the shrubs of the valley,
to see whether the vine sprouted,
the pomegranates blossomed.

[1] WEISSB. preposterously: הָסֵבִּי עֵינַיִךְ מִנֶּגְדִּי is equivalent to "turn thine eyes away from thee to me," and then the only suitable sense in the second clause must be "thine eyes encourage me." [So THRUPP: מִנֶּגֶד "opposite, over-against." The full meaning is "Thou who art standing over against me, bend thou thine eyes so as directly to meet mine."] Against this excessively artificial and over-refined interpretation of מִנֶּגֶד one single parallel is decisive, Isa. i. 16: הָסִירוּ — מִנֶּגֶד עֵינָי "put away—from before mine eyes."

[2] The Hiph. הִרְהִיב from רָהַב "to rage, be violent," most probably expresses a sense corresponding to the predicate אֲיֻמָּה, consequently not "to encourage, inspire courage," as in Ps. cxxxviii. 3, but "to assault, violently excite, take by storm." [COV., MAT.: make me too proud. CRAN., BISH.: have set me on fire. DOW.: make me flee away. ENG. VER.: overcome me; Marg.: puffed me up. THRUPP: swell my heart with pride.]

[3] Verbally corresponding with iv. 2, except in the more special הַקְּצוּבוֹת "shorn" instead of the more general expression הָרְחֵלִים "lambs" used here. [This is the meaning of the word in Arabic, but in Heb. it means "ewes, sheep."]

[4] The numeral אַחַת one, forming a marked contrast with the sixty, eighty, *etc.*, receives its proper limitation from the added הִיא: one she, *i. e.*, she only. [It is better to regard הִיא as the copula like הֵמָּה in ver. 8. GREEN'S *Heb. Gram.* § 258, 2]. That אֲחֹתִי "my sister" which stands with יוֹנָתִי תַמָּתִי "my dove, my perfect" in the parallel passage v. 2, can have influenced the selection of אַחַת "one" in this place, is very improbable (vs. WEISSB.).

[5] אַחַת הִיא cannot be taken here otherwise than it was before; the predicate is, therefore, wanting after this expression, as well as after the parallel בָּרָה הִיא, and hence the predicate of the preceding clause, *viz*: "my dove, my perfect" must be supplied here again. The meaning therefore is "only one, she alone is my dove, my darling; she alone of her mother (*i. e.* her only daughter), she as separated or chosen of her that bare her." So correctly WEISSB. in opposition to HITZ. who takes אַחַת the second time as the predicate and הִיא as subject: "she is the only one of her mother."

[6] On בָּרָה *electa* (VULG.) from ברר "to separate," comp. Ezek. xx. 38; Jer. xxiii. 28. [THRUPP: For the same reason that תמתי lit., "my perfect one" may be rendered "my own one" may ברה, lit. "pure one" be rendered "sole darling." She is her parent's "pure one"; and this would in fact be the best rendering, had not the word "pure" in its original sense become somewhat antiquated.]

[7] [MAT.: The voice of the Synagogue. WICL.: Who is she, this that goeth forth as the morrow tide, rising fair as the moon, chosen as the sun? COV., MAT.: Who is she, this that peepeth out as the morning? fair as the moon, excellent as the sun.]

[8] [GOOD, MOODY STUART and others: dazzling as the stars.]

[9] [WICL.: The voice of the church, of the synagogue, MAT.: Christ to the synagogue. COV., MAT., CRAN.: I went down into the nut-garden to see what grew by the brooks, and to look if the vineyard flourished and if the pomegranates were shot forth.]

[10] [CASTELL., PARKHURST: pruned garden as if אֱגוֹז were from גָּזַז. THRUPP without authority proposes to substitute הַגּוֹי.]

Digitized by Google

12 I[1] knew it not, my desire brought me
to the chariots of my people, the noble.

DAUGHTERS OF JERUSALEM.

VII. 1 Come[2] back, come back, Shulamith,
Come back, come back, that we may look upon thee.

SHULAMITH.

What[3] do you see in Shulamith?

DAUGHTERS OF JERUSALEM.

As the dance of Mahanaim.

SOLOMON.

2 How[4] beautiful are thy steps in the shoes, O prince's daughter,
thy rounded[5] thighs are like jewels,
the work of an artist's hands.
3 Thy navel is a round bowl,[6]
let not mixed wine be lacking![7]
thy body is a heap of wheat,
set[8] around with lilies.
4 Thy two breasts are like two fawns,
twins of a gazelle.
5 Thy neck like a tower of ivory,
thy eyes like pools in Heshbon
at the gate of the daughter of multitudes;
thy nose like the tower of Lebanon
which looks toward Damascus.
6 Thy head upon thee like Carmel,[9]
and thy flowing locks like purple—
a king fettered by curls![10]

1 [MAT.: The voice of the synagogue. COV., MAT.: Then the chariots of the prince of my people made me suddenly afraid. CRAN., BISH.: I knew not that my soul had made me the chariot of the people that be under tribute. DOW.: My soul troubled me for the chariots of Aminadab. GENEV.: I knew nothing, my soul set me as the chariots of my noble people. ENG. VER.: My soul made me like the chariots of Ammi-nadib; Marg.: Set me on the chariots of my willing people. THRUPP: "All translations which introduce a preposition before 'the chariots'—'on,' 'to,' 'among,' 'on account of,' *etc.*, are grammatically untenable." He renders: my soul had made me the chariots of my people the Freewilling.] נַפְשִׁי שָׂמַתְנִי limits the meaning of the preceding לֹא יָדַעְתִּי, though there is no necessity of supplying כִּי. The relation is rather such that the preceding principal clause is logically subordinated to the limiting and explanatory clause annexed to it, and thus yields some such sense as "without my knowing it, unawares my desire, *etc*;" comp. Job ix. 5, Isa. xlvii. 11 as well as HITZ. and HENGSTENB. *in loc.* נַפְשִׁי—which can neither be the object, nor in apposition with the subject of יָדַעְתִּי—might it is true, have the sense of "I myself" (comp. Hos. ix. 4; Job ix. 21; Ps. iii. 3, *etc.*), but as the subject of the verb שָׂמַתְנִי obtains the sense of "desire, longing," which is attested by Gen. xxiii. 8; Job xxiii. 13; 2 Kin. ix. 15, *etc.*

2 [WICL.: The voice of the church to the faith of the neophyte. MAT.: The voice of the church calling again the synagogue.]

3 [WICL.: The voice of Christ to the church, of the synagogue. MAT.: Christ to the synagogue. What pleasure have ye more in the Shulamite than when she danceth among the men of war?]

4 [WICL., MAT.: The voice of Christ to the church. MAT.: O how pleasant are thy treadings with thy shoes.

5 For חַמּוּקִים and its root חמק turn, revolve, see on v. 6, and for יְרֵכַיִם thighs, on v. 15.

6 [THRUPP: Note the homœophony in the Hebrew.] אַגַּן הַסַּהַר "bowl of roundness" is of course equivalent to "round bowl," see EWALD, § 287 f. [GREEN's *Heb. Gram.* § 254, 6, *a*] The root סהר, as appears from the Samaritan, is synonymous with סחר "to go round, surround;" comp. on the one hand סֹחֵרָה "shield," Ps. xci. 14, and on the other hand סֹהַר castle, fortress, tower; also שַׂהֲרוֹן "little moon," and the Talmudic סָהָר wall, fence.

7 [WICK.: Never needing drink. COV., MAT.: which is never without drink. DOW.: Never wanting cups. E. V.: which wanteth not liquor.]

8 סוּגָה Aramæism for שׂוּגָה; literally "hedged in lilies."

9 [GENEV.: scarlet. ENG. VER. Marg.: crimson.]

10 רְהָטִים elsewhere "channels, water-troughs" are here manifestly the flowing ringlets or locks of her hair, comp. the Lat. *coma fluens.* [COV., MAT.: like the king's purple folden up in plates. CRAN.: like purple and like a king going forth with his guards about him. DOW.: as a king's purple tied to water-pipes. GENEV.: the king is tied in the rafters; with the marginal note "he delighteth to come near thee and to be in thy company." ENG. VER.: the king is held in the galleries. WORDSWORTH: the king is bound or tied at the water-troughs, *i. e.* dispenses grace through the appointed channels.]

Digitized by Google

THIRD SCENE:

SOLOMON AND SHULAMITH (alone).

(CHAP. VII. 7.—VIII. 4.)

SOLOMON.

7 How fair art thou and how comely,
O love,[1] among delights![2]
8 This thy stature resembles a palm tree,
and thy breasts clusters.[3]
9 I[4] resolve: I will climb the palm,
will grasp its branches,[5]
and[6] be thy breasts, please, like clusters of the vine,
and the breath of thy nose[7] like apples,
10 And thy palate[8] like the best wine. . . . .

SHULAMITH (interrupting him).

—going[9] down for my beloved smoothly,[10]
gliding over the lips of sleepers.
11 I am my beloved's,
and for[11] me is his desire. — —
12 Come,[12] my beloved, let us go out to the country,[13]
lodge in the villages,
13 Start early[14] for the vineyards;
we shall see whether the vine has sprouted,
its blossoms opened,[15]
the pomegranates flowered . . . .
there will I give thee my love.[16]

1 [WICL.: Thou most dearworth. COV., MAT.: my darling. GENEV.: O my love.]

2 [THRUPP, who is quite too fond of ingenious emendations: "O daughter of allurements. We may follow the SYRIAC and AQUILA in dividing the בתענגים of our Hebrew text into the two words בת ענגים."]

3 [COV., MAT.: like the grapes.]

4 [WICL.: Christ of the holy cross saith. MAT.: The spouse speaking of the cross.]

5 [WICL., DOW.: fruits.]

6 [WICL.: The voice of Christ to the church. MAT.: The spouse to the spousess.]

7 [WICL.: The smell of thy mouth. DOW.: odor of thy mouth. COV., MAT.: the smell of thy nostrils. GENEV.: the savor of thy nose.]

8 [WICL., COV., MAT., DOW.: throat. CRAN.: jaws. BISH., GENEV., ENG. VER.: the roof of thy mouth.]

9 [WICL.: The church saith of Christ,—worthy to my love to drink, to the lips and to the teeth of him to chew. COV., MAT.: this shall be pure and clear for my love; his lips and teeth shall have their pleasure. CRAN.: which goeth straight unto my beloved and bursteth forth by the lips of the ancient elders. BISH.: which is meet for my best beloved, pleasant for his lips and for his teeth to chew. GENEV.: which goeth straight to my well-beloved and causeth the lips of the ancient to speak. DOW.: worthy for my beloved to drink and for his lips and his teeth to ruminate. ENG. VER.: that goeth down sweetly (Marg. straightly) causing the lips of those that are asleep (Marg. the ancient) to speak. THRUPP: "In so difficult a passage some variations of text must be expected; and for שפתי ישנים 'the lips of the sleepers,' the LXX, SYRIAC and AQUILA apparently concur in reading שפתי ושנים 'my lips and teeth;' to which reading the versions of SYMMACHUS and JEROME also lend partial and indirect support. It has, however, the disadvantage of being ungrammatical, the true Hebrew for 'my lips and teeth' being שפתי ושני. Moreover, the received text is decidedly upheld by the TARGUM, and yields a more appropriate meaning."]

10 On הוֹלֵךְ לְמֵישָׁרִים lit. "going according to evenness" (in an even, smooth way) comp. the similar הִתְהַלֵּךְ בְּמֵישָׁרִים Prov. xxiii. 31; also Isa. viii. 6.

11 On אֱלַי—עָלַי comp. Prov. xxix. 5; Ps. xxxvi. 3. [WICL.: I to my love and to me the turning of him. DOW.: I to my beloved and his turning is towards me. COV., MAT., CRAN.: There will I turn me unto my love, and he shall turn him unto me. BISH.: I am my beloved's and he shall turn him unto me. GENEV.: I am my well-beloved's (ENG. VER.: beloved's) and his desire is toward me. GINSBURG: "It is for me to desire him. עָלַי lit. *on me*, *i. e.* it is upon me as a duty, thus 2 Sam. xviii. 11; Prov. vii. 14"]

12 [WICL.: The voice of the church to Christ. MAT.: The church speaking to Christ.]

13 On יָצָא הַשָּׂדֶה of going out of the city into the open country comp. also 1 Sam. xx. 6.

14 "To start early (הִשְׁכִּים) for the vineyards" *i. e.* to rise early and go to them, a constr. prægnans, comp. Ew. § 282, *c.* [GREEN'S *Heb. Gram.* § 272, 3. WICL.: early rise we to the vine. COV., MAT.: in the morning will we rise betimes and go see the vineyard.]

15 The Piel פִּתַּח is to be taken reflexively, "opened themselves" (DEL., HENGSTENB., MEIER), perhaps also inchoatively, "whether they are opening, are on the point of bursting" (EW., HEILIGST., VAIH. *&c.*). For סְמָדַר comp. on ii. 13.

16 On אֶתֵּן אֶת־דֹּדַי comp. Prov. xxix. 17. [WICL. omits. COV., MAT., CRAN. BISH., my breasts.]

Digitized by Google

14 The mandrakes[1] give forth their odor,
and over our doors are all sorts of excellent fruit,[2]
new as well as old,
(which), my beloved, I have laid up for thee.[3]—
VIII. 1 O[4] that thou wert as a brother of mine,
who sucked the breasts of my mother!
should I find[5] thee without I would kiss thee,
yet[6] none would despise[7] me.
2 I would lead thee, bring thee to my mother's house,
thou[8] wouldst instruct me;
I would give thee to drink of the spiced wine,
of my pomegranate juice.
3 His left hand is under my head,
and his right embraces me.[9]—
4 I[10] adjure you, ye daughters of Jerusalem,
that ye wake not, and that ye waken not
love, till it please.

1 [WICL.: the mandrakes give their smell in our gates. All apples new and old, my love, I kept to thee. COV., MAT.: there shall the mandragoras give their smell beside our doors; there, O my love, have I kept unto thee all manner of fruits both new and old.]

2 [GENEV.: All sweet things.]

3 This last clause cannot be taken as an independent sentence (DÖPKE, ROSENM., HENGSTENB.) for then the verb would have "new fruit" likewise for its object. אֲשֶׁר must be supplied and the resulting relative clause must only be connected with the last predicate יְשָׁנִים (correctly HITZ.).

4 [WICL., MAT.: The voice of the patriarchs speaking of Christ. WICL.: Who to me giveth [DOW. shall give to me] thee my brother sucking the teats [DOW. breasts] of my mother, that I find thee alone without forth [DOW. I may find thee without] and kiss thee. COV., MAT.: O that I might find thee without and kiss thee, whom I love as my brother, which sucked my mother's breasts; and that thou wouldst not be offended if I took thee and brought thee, *etc.* CRAN.: —— and that thou shouldst not be despised. I will lead thee and bring thee, *etc.*]

5 On the conditional clause without אִם, and with nothing to mark the apodosis, comp. Hos. viii. 12; Prov. xxiv. 10; Judg. xi. 36.

6 גַּם yet, nevertheless, see EW. § 341, *a*, [GESEN. *Lex.* in verb.]

7 On בּוּז see ver. 7 below, Prov. vi. 30. Instead of לִי *me* some inferior MSS. read לָךְ *thee*, which however seems far less appropriate, and has doubtless been repeated here from the close of the preceding verse. All the ancient versions read לִי. [GENEV.: they should not despise thee; Marg. me].

8 [WICL., DOW., GENEV.: Thou shalt teach me. COV., MAT., CRAN., BISH.: that thou mightest teach me. ENG. VER.: who would instruct me.]

9 This exclamation differs from that in ii. 6, with which in other respects it agrees verbatim, merely in the omission of לְ after תַּחַת, just as תַּחַת stands alone also in ver. 5 *b*, so likewise in Ex. xxiv. 4; xxxii. 19. We have already seen vi. 3; iv. 1; vii. 4, *etc.* that the poet does not like exact verbal repetitions of formulas before used.

10 [WICL., MAT.: The voice of Christ.] Repeated with some freedom from ii. 7; iii. 5. In place of אִם there, a prohibitory מָה is introduced here (see EWALD, § 325, *b*, comp. also on v. 8 above) [AINSWORTH, with more scrupulous adherence to the form of the Hebrew expression; why should ye stir, and why should ye stir up the love.] And by omitting the gazelles and hinds of the field as well as contracting עד שתחפץ into one word by means of Makkeph, a rhythmical reduction of the whole exclamation to a verse of but two members has been attained.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. The place of the action in this new section is without doubt the same as in the foregoing act. The dialogue with the daughters of Jerusalem (v. 8, 9, 16; vi. 1–3; vii. 1); the mention of the "city" and the "keepers of its walls" in this fresh recital of a dream (v. 2–7) which reminds one of its predecessor (iii. 1–5); the "garden" of Solomon, to which he has gone down, vi. 2; finally and above all her appeal to her lover to go out with her "to the country" (vii. 12) and to the house of his chosen one's mother (viii. 2), and there in the enjoyment of simple country pleasures to become to her "as a brother who had sucked the breasts of her mother" (viii. 1); all this points to the king's palace at Jerusalem as the scene, and more probably to some room in this palace, than to "contiguous grounds" or "the royal gardens," as is thought by DELITZSCH. The room in the palace on Zion, which, according to scene 2 of the foregoing act, was used for the marriage feast, may very well be the one in which the whole of the present act was performed; for there is no indication any where of a change of scene, not even between vii. 1 and 2, or between vers. 6 and 7 of the same chapter (vs. DEL.).—The time of the action is determined by its characteristic contents to have been some days or weeks later than the wedding festivities described in act third. For the relation of love so pure and happy at the beginning has since suffered certain checks and interruptions, which reveal themselves on the part of Shulamith at least by various symptoms of uneasiness, nay, of sadness and dejection, without her betraying, however, that she has been at all wounded or actually injured by her husband. The dream, which she tells her companions at the beginning of the section that

Digitized by Google

she has very recently had in the night, begins exactly like the preceding, and runs on partly in the same way. It does not, however, end as that does in a bright and joyous manner, but with pain and fright. Seeking her beloved by night, she not only fails to find him—she is beaten and robbed by the watchmen! Her gloomy misgiving in respect to the unfaithfulness of her lover, expressed in her apprehension that she might soil her feet again, which had just been washed (v. 8, see *in loc.*), proves to be only too correct, and drives her therefore with an anxious and troubled heart to have it said to her lover, who has actually forsaken her for a time, "that she is sick of love"—of loving solicitude about his heart partially averted and alienated from her (v. 8)! She expresses this solicitude, it is true, not by open complaint; on the contrary, in what follows she sedulously avoids dropping any thing to the disadvantage of her husband in the hearing of the ladies of the court (v. 10–16), she apologizes for his leaving her by the harmless assumption that he may have gone "to feed in the gardens and to gather lilies," vi. 2, and only inserts in her exclamation at the close an allusion indicative of painful longing in respect to the way that she wishes to be and to remain her beloved's, *viz.*, that he should now as formerly "feed among the lilies," that he should be and remain a guileless, pure and simple-hearted country lover (vi. 3)!—When, therefore, Solomon himself returns to her after a considerable absence, the manifestations of her partial dissatisfaction with him assume a somewhat altered form. She regards him gravely and sternly, and thus leads him in the picture of her beauty and loveliness, which, full of ecstacy, he again begins to sketch (vi. 4 ff.; comp. iv. 1 ff.) to introduce some allusions to her "terribleness" (vi. 4, 10), as well as to the effect of the glance of her eyes (vi. 5 *a*), which "overcome" or "dismay" him. The spirited statement of the prior rank accorded to her above all his wives and virgins, into which this description finally passes (vi. 8–10), she leaves wholly unnoticed; nay, she answers it with a description of what she once did and was engaged in, when a simple country maid in happier circumstances, and with more agreeable surroundings (vi. 11), and thereupon she gives him plainly enough to understand that the elevation bestowed upon her in consequence of her love "to the state-carriages of her people, the noble," *i. e.* to the highest rank among the nobles of her people, had also led to her being painfully undeceived (vi. 12). She even wishes to escape from the society of the voluptuous ladies of the court, which has become irksome to her, and she is induced to return and remain, not so much by their urgent entreaties and representations (vii. 1) as simply and alone by her unconquerable love to Solomon, whom she hopes finally to free from his corrupt surroundings and to gain wholly for herself and for the purer pleasures of her life at home.—To the new and exaggerated laudation of her charms, in which her lover hereupon indulges (vii. 2 ff.) she listens in silence; as in one place at least they offend against the rules of modesty (vii. 8), she deigns not to answer. Not until the other ladies had left her alone with Solomon, does she venture to open her heart to him and to give free expression to her longing desire, which has been most strongly aroused, to return to her home and to have her lover changed from a voluptuous servant of sin to an innocent child of nature like herself. She does this by interrupting (vii. 10) the fond language of her husband just where it had become most urgent and tender, and chiming in with what had been begun by him. With extraordinary address and delicacy she first, as it were, disarms and fetters him (vii. 10, 11) and then brings her desire before him with such overpowering force and urgency that refusal is impossible, and he is borne along as on the wings of the wind by her pure love, which triumphs thus over the enticements and temptations of his court (vii. 12 ff.). He need not utter a word of express consent to her request; she has him completely in her power, and as he has just called himself "a king fettered by her locks" (vii. 6), she but briefly refers to the fact, that his whole desire is toward her (vii. 11 *b*), that "his left arm is under her head, and his right embraces her" (viii. 3), and then leaves the scene on the arm of her beloved with that exclamation twice before uttered to the daughters of Jerusalem (viii. 4), and which this time has the force of farewell advice.*

* [That Solomon had given Shulamith any occasion for disquietude, or that her pain at his absence arose from a suspicion of the constancy, warmth or purity of his affection, is the merest figment without the shadow of a foundation in the language of the Song. Solomon is Shulamith's ideal as she is his. She does not utter one word of complaint to others or of reproach to him. There is nothing to imply that in her most secret thoughts she censures him for an absence which is intolerable to her. As far as there is any blame in the case, she casts it upon her own drowsy sluggishness, which forbore to open to him promptly and grant him the admission that he sought. Even this, however, occurring as it did in a dream, seems to be told not so much in a spirit of self-reproach as to demonstrate that she was "sick of love." She longs for her beloved every moment, and, sleeping or waking, he is ever in her thoughts, and she is uneasy and restless when he is not by her side. But her confidence is unabated that she is her beloved's and her beloved is hers, vi. 3. Her language respecting him is that of affectionate admiration, v. 10, *etc.*, and his to her is that of the most tender fondness, vi. 4, *etc.* There has been a brief separation, but there is nothing to indicate so much as a momentary estrangement on her part or on his.

The current allegorical interpretations seem here to be at fault in one direction as much as that of ZÖCKLER errs in the other. The image of ideal love presented in the Song should not be marred by the untimely introduction of any thing outside of itself, whether the sins and inconsistencies of the church or of believing souls on the one hand, or the actual historical character of Solomon as learned from Kings and Chronicles on the other. We are not at liberty to put constraint upon the language here employed for the sake of making the bride mirror forth the deficiencies of the Church or of preserving the consistency of Solomon's character as represented here with all that is recorded of him elsewhere.

The bride supplies an emblem of devoted attachment and faithful love, which is to be set before the Church as the ideal towards which she should tend, and after which she should aspire and struggle, rather than as a picture which has been or is realized in her actual life. It is a bride loving, longing for, delighting in her lord, but conscious of no unfaithfulness on her part and suspecting none on his.

And the bridegroom is equally removed from any charge of inconstancy. The military metaphor of vi. 4, 5, to which ZÖCKLER appeals, is not suggestive of frowns or of displeasure any more than iv. 4 or the strong language of iv. 9. It is her incomparable charms, the batteries of beauty and of love which assault him with such resistless energy that he pleads for quarter. Nor is there any foundation for the desire attributed to Shulamith to escape from Solomon's court or to have him forsake it on account of its presumed excesses. It certainly cannot be deduced from language which simply expresses an exquisite delight in natural objects, and a wish to enjoy them in the company of her beloved, and to possess the opportunity which would thus be afforded for uninterrupted and unrestricted converse. The language of the bride

Digitized by Google

2. The sketch here given of the inner progress of the action in the course of this act departs in several important particulars from the view of the later interpreters; but it appears to us to be the only one which corresponds with the language and the design of the poet. It is principally distinguished from the view of DELITZSCH, which approaches it most nearly, by its taking the "little disturbances" and troubles in the life of the newly married pair, which this scholar also affirms, to be more serious and real, and not restricting them for instance barely to the tragic contents of that story of her dream (v. 2–7) but letting the dissatisfaction of the chaste bride with the voluptuous conduct of the king and his court come properly forward as the actual cause of the clouded horizon of their married state. Our view too repels the assumption shared by DELITZSCH with several recent commentators, but destitute of proof, that the description of Shulamith's charms contained in vii. 2 ff. was occasioned by a "country-dance" which she was executing before him and the ladies of the court,—a hypothesis dubious in every point of view, and upon which Shulamith's character could scarcely be freed from moral taint (for the dance in question, the "dance of Mahanaim" can scarcely be conceived of as other than an unchaste pantomime); and from this it would be but a single step to the notion of RENAN that Solomon in this passage describes the charms of a danseuse of the harem, or to the similar one of HITZIG, that the king is here "cooing round a concubine." Finally our view differs in one point at least from that of DELITZSCH in respect to the division into scenes, inasmuch as it rejects the opening of a new scene or even act after vi. 9 (comp. *in loc.*, as well as the Introduction, § 2, Rem. 2), and consequently takes the whole to be one act with three scenes, of which the first extends to vi. 8; the second to vii. 6; and the third from that to viii. 4. Against the assumption of a point of division after vii. 6 it has often indeed been urged (see *e. g.* Ew., HITZ., WEISSB., and HENGSTENB. too) that the passage vii. 2–10 forms a continuous description of the beauties of the beloved, beginning with her feet and ending with her nose and palate. But with the more general exclamation vii. 7, "How fair and how delightful art thou, O Love, among the joys!" this description evidently assumes an entirely different character from that it had before in vers. 2-6, where the individual members are enumerated very much as had been done previously (iv. 1-3 and vi. 5-7) only in inverted order, and certain comparisons are instituted with them. And what Shulamith says to her lover (vii. 10 ff.) in the closest connection with the second description (or rather interrupting it and proceeding of her own motion), is of such a nature that it can scarcely be conceived of as spoken in the presence of the "daughters of Jerusalem," who had been present before. On which account DELITZSCH's assumption that a new scene begins with vii. 7, does not in fact deserve so unceremonious an epithet as that of "purely gratuitous," which HITZIG bestows upon it. The assumption of HITZ., BÖTTCHER, REN. and HENGSTENBERG that a new scene does not begin until vii. 12, might with equal propriety be denominated gratuitous; and so might many other modes of division which differ from ours, *e. g.*, that followed by EWALD, DÖPKE, BÖTTCHER, HITZ., HENGSTENB., *etc.*, and in general by most of the recent writers according to which a new scene opens with vii. 2; that of VAIH. and others (particularly the older writers) which begins this new scene with vii. 1; the assertion of EWALD that vi. 10—vii. 1 is a dialogue between the ladies of the court and Shulamith which is repeated by Solomon, *etc.* The question as to the beginning and end of the scenes in this act moreover appears to be of little consequence, inasmuch as the locality of the action, as has been before shown, does not change.* The only matters involved are 1) an entrance at vi. 4 of Solomon, who had not been present before and 2) an exit or retirement of the chorus in the neighborhood of vii. 6, or vii. 11. And this retirement of the chorus is furthermore, as is shown by the epiphonema viii. 4, probably not to be conceived of as a total disappearance but simply as a withdrawal to the background, as toward the end of Act first (see above, p. 62).

vii. 11, 12 is entirely parallel to ii. 10-13 in the mouth of her lover. And the indelicacy alleged in vii. 2 is not in the pure language of the song, nor in the chaste and beautiful emblems employed, but must be wholly charged to the account of mal-interpretation. Commentators of what our author justly terms the profane-erotic class have put their own offensive glosses upon this Song; and some devout and evangelical interpreters have unfortunately made concessions which the facts of the case do not warrant. There is not the slightest taint of impurity or immodesty to be found in any portion of this elegant lyric.—TR.]

3. SCENE FIRST. *a.* SHULAMITH'S STORY OF HER DREAM, v. 2–8.—This like the similar passage iii. 1–5 must be a dream, which Shulamith had had shortly before, and which she now relates as indicative of the state of her mind. In opposition to the opinion that Shulamith is relating a real outward occurrence (DÖPKE, HAHN, WEISSB., *etc.*) may be urged both the analogy of that prior passage and that such an affair is inconceivable in the history of Solomon's love to Shulamith. It would have conflicted with decorum for that, which is narrated in vs. 2–5, to have actually taken place; and for the favorite of the king to have been beaten and robbed by the city nightwatch as is related ver. 7, would form the *non plus ultra* of historical improbability. Besides the visionary character of the experience described is indicated not only by the introductory words, when correctly explained, "I was sleeping but my heart was waking," but also by several characteristic particulars, as ver. 8 and 6.

Ver. 2. **I was sleeping but my heart was waking.**—HITZIG adduces a striking parallel to the thought that in a dream the heart or spirit is awake, while the rest of the person sleeps, from CIC. *de divin.* I. 30: "*jacet corpus dormientis ut mortui, viget antem et vivit animus.*" WEISSBACH's objections (p. 211) to this parallel as inadmissible amount to nothing. Comp. F. SPLITTGERBER, *Schlaf und Tod, nebst den damit zusammenhängenden Erscheinungen des Seelenlebens* (Halle, 1866), p. 87 ff., espec. p. 43: "The soul is still in the body during sleep, though freer from it than in the state of wakefulness. It is in a condition of inner self-collection and concentration in order that it may afterwards operate

* [The difficulty of finding a suitable beginning and close for these divisions suggests a doubt of their certainty, or at least of their importance.—TR.]

Digitized by Google

with the greater force upon the course of things around it in its particular sphere of life." And p. 71, "The soul sinks down in sleep to its innermost life-hearth, and loses itself there in that potential self-consciousness, which forms the proper essential quality of our spirits;—— whilst in dreams it lifts itself to a comparatively higher region, that of the dawning consciousness, as it were, a region which stands considerably nearer the surface of the outward life and the daily consciousness, which moves upon it, and whose images therefore leave behind more impressive traces in our memory, which extend into our waking moments." Hence Göschel not incorrectly remarks: "If sleep is to be conceived of as depression, (καταφορά), dreaming is elevation (αναφορά)." From this statement also it further appears why the view maintained by Grot. and Döpke, that אני ישנה ולבי ער denotes a condition midway between sleep and wakefulness, a semi-sleep, is superfluous; an opinion by the way, which has the meaning of the words against it, for "I slept" is not the same thing as "I was half asleep." The heart stands here in its customary O. Test. sense of the centre and organ of the entire life of the soul, not barely for the intellectual faculties of the soul, the region of thought, as Hitzig maintains. Comp. further on Prov. ii. 10 (in this commentary.)—**Hark, my beloved is knocking: Open to me, my sister, my dear, my dove, my perfect.** Compared with the similar passage ii. 8 this fond quadruple address shows a considerable advance in the relation between the loving pair. The predicate "my fair one," which there stands with "my dear" is here wholly wanting, and is supplied by the more intimate "my sister," which since Shulamith's marriage had become the common pet name, by which Solomon called her (see iv. 9, 10, 12, v. 1). He had it is true already said "my dove" to her before their nuptials (ii. 14, comp. again vi. 9); but "my perfect" is an entirely new appellation (comp. likewise again vi. 9), which it is likely was first adopted after their marriage, and by which Solomon probably designed to express her innocence and purity (תַּמָּה perfect, *integra*) in contrast with the character of his other wives, who were not so perfect and pure. For he can scarcely have employed this appellation unmeaningly, as "my angel" among us (*vs.* Döpke and Hitz.), [nor can it mean as Thrupp alleges "mine perfectly or entirely."]—**For my head is filled with dew, my locks with drops of the night.** The copiousness of the nightly fall of dew in Palestine is attested also by the well-known history of Gideon's fleece, Judg. vi. 38; comp. also Ps. cx. 3; 2 Sam. xvii. 12; Mic. v. 6; Bar. ii. 25. That Shulamith sees her lover come to her window dripping with the dew of the night, and chilly too in consequence, might seem to imply that she thought of him as a shepherd, who as ἀγραυλῶν "abiding in the field" (Luke ii. 8) had had to endure wet and cold, and hence had sought shelter in her dwelling. But to explain that representation it is sufficient to assume that the first half of her dream (vers. 2–4) transports her back to her home, or in other words that now in her dream, as she had done before when awake (see i. 7; ii. 16; iv. 6) she transfers her lover without more ado from the sphere of royalty to that of a shepherd's life. That in the latter half of her dream (vers. 6, 7) she thinks of him again as living in the city, and herself too as wandering about in the city looking for him, is a feature of the most delicate psychological truth, which has its analogue in the story of her previous dream, iii 1–4.

Ver. 3. **I have taken off my dress.** כֻּתָּנְתִּי lit., "my tunic, my under garment." She here too thinks herself back again in her former humble circumstances, where she commonly wore nothing but a tunic, χιτών (comp. Ex. xxii. 25 f.; 2 Sam. xiii. 18, also Mark vi. 9,) and consequently in the night was entirely unclothed with the exception of the warm covering or upper garment (שִׂמְלָה, Ex. *ibid.*, Gen. ix. 23; Deut. xxii. 17) under which she slept.—**I have washed my feet: how shall I soil them?** This is again another particular referring back to her former scanty mode of life in the country. She did not then wear the shoes, which since her elevation to be a prince's daughter (vii. 2) she was now obliged to wear: on the contrary she ordinarily went barefoot in the house and in its immediate vicinity, except in long walks in the country when she wore sandals, (comp. Am. ii. 6, viii. 6; Deut. xxix. 4; Josh. ix. 5). Hence the feet washed before going to bed might easily get dirty again on the floor of the house. The soiling of the feet is in the religious and ethical region a symbol of moral contamination from the petty transgressions of every-day life (John xiii. 10); and in the figurative language of dreams it is a well-known symbol of moral defilement reproved by the conscience and accompanied with shame, comp. (Schubert, *Symbolik des Traums*, 3d edit. p. 18, Splittberger, *ibid.* p. 128 ff.*). It is therefore from going out to her lover, this symbol of more intimate and enduring intercourse with him, that she apprehends the soiling of her feet. Hence the objections which she makes to complying with his request, and the cold, almost indifferent, if not exactly "rude" (Del.) tone of her answer.†

Ver. 4. **My beloved extended his hand through the window.** מִן־הַחוֹר lit., from the hole,‡ *i. e.*, through the latticed window (for that is certainly what is intended here, as appears from ii. 9, not a mere opening in the wall as Hitz. supposes) and from it toward me.§

* A marked instance of this is to be found in the well-known dream of the youthful Ansgar at Corbie, of the broad morass, which prevented him from coming to his mother and other pious women, whom he saw in the company of the blessed virgin on a delightful road, comp. A. Tappehorn, *Leben des heil.* Ansgar, *Apostels Von Dänemark, etc. Munst.* 1863, p. 69 f. Rimbert, *Vita S. Ansgarii, c.* 2, in Pertz, Monum. Germaniæ Tom. II. p. 690.

† [Burrowes states the true sense much more simply and correctly: "These words mean, that as the bride had retired to rest, she could not put herself to the trouble of arising even to let in the beloved."]

‡ [Not "withdrew his hand from the hole," a rendering mentioned by Ainsworth, disapproved by Williams, and adopted by Burrowes and Ginsburg]

§ [Percy: "It was the ancient custom to secure the door of a house by a cross bar or bolt; which at night was fastened with a little button or pin. In the upper part of the door was left a round hole, through which any person from without might thrust his arm, and remove the bar, unless this additional security were superadded." Thrupp: "The hole

Digitized by Google

This gesture of extending (שלח) the hand in does not signify his intention to climb in through the window (HITZ.), nor his desire to gain access by forcibly breaking a hole through the wall (HENGSTENBERG after Ezek. viii. 7, 8) [so WORDSWORTH], but is rather the expression of an urgent request to be admitted. The customary gesture of a petitioner is, it is true that of spreading forth his hands פָּרַשׂ כַּפָּיו (Ex. ix. 29–31, *etc.*) But this could not be done in the present instance on account of the smallness of the window and the darkness of the night, and would besides have been unsuitable in relation to his beloved, for everywhere else it appears only as a usage in prayer. He must here, therefore, in craving admission adopt a gesture, which would at the same time express his longing to be united with his beloved (comp. DEL. and WEISSB. *in loc.*)—**And I was inwardly excited over him**; lit., "my bowels* were agitated, sounded over him"—which according to Jer. xxxi. 20; Isa. xvi. 11; lxiii. 15 is equivalent to "I felt a painful sympathy for him." This was of course because she had let him stand out in the wet and cold. According to the reading עָלַי (so the so-called Erfurt Ms., see DE ROSSI *in loc.*) the feeling expressed would be regret instead of pity: "my bowels were agitated on me" (*i. e.* in me, or over me, on my account—comp. HITZ. and EW. *in loc.*) But this slenderly attested reading appears to have crept into the text from Ps. xlii. 6, 12, and for this reason to deserve no attention.

Ver. 5. **Up I rose to open to my beloved.** אֲנִי stands after קַמְתִּי without special emphasis, according to the more diffuse style of speaking among the people. So HITZ. no doubt correctly, whilst WEISSB., is certainly far astray in asserting that Shulamith means by this אֲנִי to emphasize "her entire person in contrast with any particular parts."† **And my hands dropped with myrrh and my fingers with liquid myrrh upon the handle of the bolt.** That is to say, as my hands touched the handle of the bolt (or lock on the door of the house) in order to shove it back and open it, they dropped, *etc.* עַל כַּפּוֹת הַמַּנְעוּל, whose genuineness MEIER suspects without any reason, plainly shows that the dropping of myrrh did not proceed from Shulamith's anointing herself, as she rose and dressed, (as MAGN. and WEISSB. imagine) [so too BURROWES], but from the fact that her lover had taken hold of the door on the outside with profusely anointed hands, and so had communicated the fluid unguent of myrrh to the bolt inside likewise.* This might have resulted from the unguent flowing in from the outer lock through the keyhole (HITZ.), or some drops of myrrh from the hand of her lover inserted through the hole above the door, might have trickled down upon the inner lock, which was directly beneath (DEL.). Too accurate an explanation of the affair seems inadmissible from the indefinite dreamlike character of the whole narrative. But at any rate an anointing of the outer lock of the door by the lover on purpose is not to be thought of (with LESS., DÖPKE, EW., VAIH., *etc.*) because though classic parallels† may be adduced for this "silent homage of love," none can be brought from oriental antiquity. —מוֹר עֹבֵר is not "overflowing myrrh,"‡ *i. e.*, dealt out in copious abundance (EW.), but myrrh exuding or flowing out of itself in contrast with that which is solidified and gum-like, σμύρνα στακτή in contrast with σμ. πλαστή (THEOPHR. *Hist. Plant.* 9, 4); comp. מָר דְּרוֹר Ex. xxx. 23, as well as above on i. 13.

Ver. 6. **I opened to my beloved**, comp. on 5 *a*.—**And my beloved had turned away, was gone. My soul failed when he spoke.** That is, before, when he was speaking to me through the window (vers. 2, 4), my breath forsook me, my soul almost went out of me.§ It is consequently a supplementary remark, whose principal verb, however, is not necessarily to be taken as a pluperfect (vs. DÖPKE).—**I sought him but I did not find him; I called him but he did not answer me.** With the first

is that through which according to the fashion of eastern doors, a person from without thrusts in his hand in order to insert the key and so to open it, see THOMSON *The Land and the Book*, chap. xxii."]

* [ALEXANDER (Comm. on Isa. xvi. 11): "The viscera are evidently mentioned as the seat of the affections. Modern usage would require heart and bosom. BARNES correctly applies to this verse the distinction which philologists have made between the ancient usage of *bowels* to denote the upper viscera and its modern restriction to the lower viscera, a change which sufficiently accounts for the different associations excited by the same or equivalent expressions then and now."]

† [THRUPP: "*up I arose.*" Literally "I arose." So too at the beginning of the next verse the literal rendering is simply "I opened." But in both places the use, contrary to the Hebrew custom of the pronoun אֲנִי "I" is emphatic; and seems to indicate an alertness and forwardness, which must in an English rendering be expressed in some other manner.]

* [THRUPP thinks the myrrh came from the hands of the bridegroom, WORDSWORTH from those of the bride. WILLIAMS: "Commentators in general suppose that the perfume here called liquid myrrh, proceeded from the moisture of his hands, wet with dew; and the compliment in this view is very elegant and beautiful, implying that the fragrance of his body perfumed everything which came in contact with it. If the perfume, however, be referred to the spouse, I think it will imply that she had anointed herself with such luxuriancy that her fingers were still wet with myrrh; and this would partly account for her reluctancy to rise, since indulgence naturally induces sloth." GOOD and PATRICK strangely imagine that in her haste to reach the door she overturned a vase of fragrance which agreeably to oriental practice she had prepared for her lover.]

† Particularly Lucretius, IV. 1171:

"At lacrimans exclusus amator limina sæpe
Floribus et sertis operit, postesque superbos
Unguit amaracino et foribus miser oscula figit."

Comp. also Tibull. I. ii. 14; Athenæ. ed. Casaubon, I. 669.

‡ [GOOD: "Pure or perhaps liquid myrrh, that which weeps or drops from the tree, the most esteemed but most expensive of this class of perfumes."]

§ [NOYES gives the most satisfactory explanation of this expression: "*I was not in my senses;* literally, 'my soul was gone from me.' The meaning most suited to the connection is, that she acted insanely in not admitting her beloved at his request. It seems to denote that bewilderment of the faculties caused by fear, as in Gen. xlii. 28, or by any other passion; here by the passion of love." Or rather the bewilderment intended would seem to be that strange want of self-possession so common in dreams, in consequence of which a person does precisely the wrong thing, and as the result, finds himself in most embarrassing and trying situations. WESTMINSTER ANNOTATIONS: "My neglect of his speech troubled me when he was gone." SCOTT: "Either she now recollected his former most tender and affectionate call which she had resisted; or he spake a reproving word as he withdrew, which filled her with extreme distress." THRUPP: "My soul failed me for what he had spoken. Here the reference must be to the words uttered by the bridegroom when he first presented himself at the door: for there is no record of his speaking subsequently." GINSBURG: "When he spoke of it, *i. e.*, of his going away." MOODY STUART: "My soul failed for his speaking; with mingled desire and fear she listens till her soul faints within her."]

Digitized by Google

of these lines comp. iii. 2 *b;* with both together Prov. i. 28; viii. 17.

Ver. 7. **Found me then the watchmen,** *etc.* Comp. iii. 3, Hitz. correctly: "In her previous dream the watchmen make no reply to her question; here without being questioned they reply by deeds."—**Took my veil off from me.** רְדִיד (from רָדַד spread out, disperse, make thin) is according to Isa. iii. 23 a fine light material thrown over the person like a veil, such as was worn by noble ladies in Jerusalem; comp. Targ. on Gen. xxiv. 65; xxxviii. 14 where רדידא represents the Heb. צָעִיף.* נָשְׂאוּ מֵעָלַי certainly means not a bare "lifting" (Meier), but a forcible tearing off and taking away of this article of dress; else this expression would not form with the preceding "they struck me, wounded me," the climax, which the poet evidently intends.—**The watchmen of the walls;** not the subject of the immediately preceding clause (Weissb.), but a repetition of the principal subject which stands at the beginning of the verse. In her complaint she naturally comes back to the ruffians who had done all this to her, the villainous watchmen.—"Watchmen of the walls," whose functions relate as in this instance to the interior of the city, and who, therefore, were not appointed principally with a view to the exterior circuit walls, occur also Isa. lxii. 6.

Ver. 8. **I adjure you,** *etc.* For this expression, as well as the masc. form of address, comp. on ii. 7.—**What shall ye tell him?** So correctly Ew., Heiligstedt, Del., Hengstenb. *etc.;* for although מָה sometimes expresses an earnest negative or prohibition, and might therefore be synonymous with אִם in ii. 7; iii. 5, yet the translation "do not tell him that I am sick of love" (Weissb. and others) yields a less natural sense than the one given above, according to which Shulamith seeks to induce her lover to a speedy return by the intelligence of her being sick of love. And in fact she connects a charge of this purport to the daughters of Jerusalem immediately with the narrative of her dream, because this had already evidenced in various ways that she had an almost morbid longing for her lover (see especially ver. 4, *b;* vers. 6, 7.)

4. Continuation. *b.* Shulamith's description of her lover, v. 9–16.

Ver. 9. **What is thy beloved more than** (any other) **beloved, thou fairest among women?** This question of the daughters of Jerusalem which serves in an admirable way to connect what precedes with the following description of the beauty of her lover, springs from the assumption readily suggested by vers. 2–4, that Shulamith's lover was some other than Solomon; an assumption admitted without scruple by the voluptuous ladies of the court, in spite of their knowledge of the fact that Shulamith had shortly before given her hand to the king as her lawful husband. It is therefore a question of real ignorance and curiosity,* which they here address to Shulamith, not the mere show of a question with the view of leading her to the enthusiastic praise of the king who was well known to the ladies of the court and beloved by them likewise (Del.); and quite as little was it a scornful question (Döpke, Meier) or reproachful (Magn.) or one involving but a gentle reproof (Hitz.)—against these last opinions the words "fairest among women" are decisive.

Ver. 10. **My beloved is white and ruddy, distinguished above ten thousand.** This general statement precedes the more detailed description of the beauties of her lover, which then follows vers. 11-15 in ten particulars, at the close of which (ver. 16) stands another general eulogium.—The aim of the entire description is evidently to depict Solomon, as one who is without blemish from head to foot, as is done 2 Sam. xiv. 25, 26 in the case of his brother Absalom. A commendation of his fair color, or his good looks in general fitly stands at the head of the description.—צַח lit., "dazzling white;" stronger than לָבָן; an expression which may be applied to a king's son, but scarcely to a simple young shepherd from the country. His face might very well be called ruddy or brownish (as 1 Sam xvi. 12) but scarcely dazzling white; and it is to the face that the predicate mainly refers, as a comparison with vers. 14 and 15 shows.—To white as the fundamental color is added the blooming red (אָדוֹם) of the cheeks and other parts of the face both here in the case of Solomon and Lam. iv. 7 in the description of the fair Nazarites of Jerusalem, which reminds one of the passage before us.—"Distinguished above ten thousand," lit. "from ten thousand, or a myriad" (רְבָבָה), *i. e.*, surpassing an immense number in beauty. Comp. Ps. xci. 7, as well as the plur. רבבות Ps. iii. 7; Deut. xxxiii. 17.—דָּגוּל from דֶּגֶל "standard, banner," as in Lat. *insignis* from *signum*, denotes one that is conspicuous as a standard amidst a host of other men, signalized, distinguished above others, and מִן is again comparative as in ver. 9. The expression is evidently a military one like נִדְגָּלוֹת vi. 4, 10.

Ver. 11. **His head is pure gold.** The comparison is not directed to the color of the face, as though this was to be represented as a reddish brown (Hitz.), but to the appearance of the head as a whole. From the combined radiance of his fresh and blooming countenance, and of his glossy black hair adorned with a golden crown, it presented to the beholder at a distance the appearance of a figure made of solid gold with a reddish lustre. כֶּתֶם according to Gesen., Hengstenb., and others, equivalent to that which is hidden, concealed=gold that is treasured up; according to Dietrich and others from כתם "to be solid, dense," hence massive gold; according to Hitz., Weissb., *etc.*, equivalent to that which is

*[Thrupp: "It seems to be generally agreed that the word רדיד occurring here, and at Isaiah iii. 23, denotes a wide and thin garment, such as Eastern ladies to the present day throw over all the rest of their dress. The Germans well translate it Schleierkleid, veil-garment." Good: "To tear away the veil from an Eastern lady is one of the greatest indignities that can be offered to her."]

*[Much better Thrupp: "That the dramatic form may be preserved a question is here put by the chorus of the Daughters of Jerusalem in order to furnish occasion for the description which follows." It is also to be observed that the inquiry is not who he is, as though it implied their ignorance of his person, but what is he. They simply wish to draw from her her estimate of him.—Tr.]

Digitized by Google

reddish, of red lustre, which latter explanation is favored by Arabic parallels and by the expression נכתם Jer. ii. 22. The adjective פָּז connected with it designates this gold as carefully refined and purified (comp. the Hoph. part. מוּפָז with the like sense 1 Kin. x. 18).—**His locks are hill upon hill.** תַּלְתַּלִּים may be thus explained with Del., Weissb., *etc.*, by deriving it from תָּלַל to raise, heap up (whence תֵּל a hill and תָּלוּל high, Ezek. xvii. 22). Commonly "palm branches," ("flexible or curling palm branches" from תלל in the sense of "wavering or swaying to and fro"); or "pendent, hanging locks" (from תלה *suspendit*—so Hengstenb.); or "pendulous clusters of grapes" (as though זַלְזַלִּים=תלתלים Isa. xviii. 5—so Hitz.). The comparison reminds us somewhat of that with the flock of goats on Mount Gilead (iv. 2; vi. 5); which was also designed to set forth his long curling locks piled one on another.—**Black as a raven.** Parallels to this simile from Arab. poets, see in Hartmann, *Ideal weibl. Schönheit*, I. 45 f., comp. Magnus *on Cant.* iv. 1 (p. 85) and Döpke *in loc.* The latter adduces particularly two verses of Motanebbi (from J. v. Hammer, p. 11):

> "Black as a raven and thick as midnight gloom,
> Which of itself, with no hairdresser, curls."

Ver. 12. **His eyes like doves by brooks of water.** On the comparison of the eyes with doves comp. i. 15. In this case it is not doves in general, but particularly doves sitting "by brooks of water" (lit. water-channels or beds) to which the eyes are likened doubtless in order to represent the lustrous brightness and the moisture of the white of the eye by a figure like that employed vii. 5, and to place it in fitting contrast with the iris whose varied hues resemble the plumage of the dove.—**Bathing in milk, sitting on fulness.** A further description of the relation of the "doves" to the "brooks of water," *i. e.* of the iris (with the pupil) to the white that surrounds it. These water-brooks here appear to be filled up with milk instead of water, and the doves answering to the irides of both eyes are represented as bathing in this milk and accordingly as "sitting on" or "by fulness"—in which there is an allusion likewise to the convex form of the eye (correctly the Septuag., Vulg., Syr., and after them Hengstenb., Weissbach, *etc.*). מְלֵאת, lit. "fulness," an idea undefined in itself, is here limited by the preceding אפיקי מים and therefore means "the fulness of the water-courses, that which fills them up" (Weissb.); and the עַל which stands before it, indicates the same sense substantially of sitting by this fulness, as is expressed by the same preposition before אפיקי מים (comp. Ps. i. 3). Others take מְלֵאת in the sense of "setting" as of a gem (comparing מִלֵּאת אֶבֶן Ex. xxviii. 17) and hence translate "enthroned in a setting" (Magn.) or "jewels finely set" (Böttch., Del., preceded by Ibn Ezra, Jarch., Rosenm., Winer). But in opposition to this may be urged both the absence of אֶבֶן after the indefinite מלאת, and the prep. עַל instead of which בְּ might rather have been expected. More correctly Coccejus and Döpke, who explain it "over the setting" *i. e.* "over the edge of the brook," though still they do violence to the natural meaning of מלאת.

Ver. 13. **His cheeks like a bed of balm.** The tert. compar. is not barely their delightful fragrance, but likewise the superb growth of beard upon his cheeks. Shulamith would scarcely have compared beardless cheeks with a bed of balm, *i. e.* a garden plot covered with plants. That she likens the two cheeks to but one bed may be explained from the fact that the beard, which likewise surrounds the chin and lips, unites them into one whole, which like the borders in many gardens has its two parallel sides (comp. Hitzig). The punctuation עֲרוּגֹת, which the ancient versions seem to have followed (*e. g.* Vulg. "*sicut areolæ aromatum*") and which Weissb. still prefers, accordingly appears to be less suitable than the sing. עֲרוּגַת here retained by the Masorites; whilst the plur. עֲרוּגוֹת is unquestionably the true reading in vi. 2.—**Towers of spice plants.** The expression מִגְדְּלוֹת מֶרְקָחִים is doubtless so to be understood, as explanatory apposition to עֲרוּגַת הַבֹּשֶׂם and the bed of balm is accordingly to be conceived of as a plot embracing several "towers" or pyramidal elevations of aromatic herbs, by which the rich luxuriance of his beard and perhaps also its fine curly appearance is most fitly set forth (Ew., Delitzsch, Hengstenb., *etc.*). We can see no ground for the scruples, which are alleged to stand in the way of this explanation, or why we must with J. Cappellus suppose a reference to "boxes of unguents" (*pyxides unguentorum*) or with Hitzig, Friedr., Weissb., follow the Septuag. (φύουσαι μυρεψικά) in reading the part. מְגַדְּלוֹת. The fem. plur. מִגְדְּלוֹת from מִגְדָּל is also attested by viii. 10. The custom of raising fragrant plants on mounds of earth of a pyramidal or high tower-like shape, receives sufficient confirmation from iv. 6 (the "mountain of myrrh" and the "hill of frankincense"). And the whole comparison appears to be entirely appropriate, if we but think of the beard on the chin and cheeks of her lover as not merely a soft down (Hitz.) but as a vigorous, finely cultivated and carefully arranged growth of hair. And in this we are justified in precise proportion as we rid ourselves of the notion of a youthful lover of the rank of a shepherd, and keep in view king Solomon in the maturity of middle life as the object of the description before us. Besides the circumstance that they were in the habit of perfuming the beard, as is still done to a considerable extent in the east (see Arvieux, *R.*, p. 52; della Valle, II. 98; Harmer, *Beobacht.*, II. 77, 83; Reiske on *Tarafa*, p. 46) may have contributed its share to the particular form of the comparison.—**His lips lilies, dropping liquid myrrh.**

Digitized by Google

Of course it is not white but red lilies, lilies of the color, denoted iv. 8 by the "crimson thread," to which the lips of her lover are here likened. The "dropping of liquid myrrh" (comp. on ver. 8) refers not to the lilies (Syr., Rosenm.) but directly to the lips. It serves to represent the lovely fragrance of the breath, which issues from her lips (comp vii. 9); for the "loveliness of his speech" (Hengstenb., comp. Targ.) is not mentioned till ver. 16.

Ver. 14. **His hands golden rods.** Others, as Coccei., Gesen., (*Thesaur.* p. 287), Rosenm., Döpke, Vaih., [so Eng. Ver.], take גְּלִילֵי זָהָב to be gold rings, which they refer to the bent or closed hand, with allusion also to the finger-nails colored with alhenna as compared with the jewels of the rings. Very arbitrarily, because 1) the curved or hollow hand must necessarily have been denoted by כַּף; 2) the proper expression for ring would not have been גָּלִיל but חוֹתָם or טַבַּעַת; 3) מְמֻלָּאִים could no more express the idea of being "set with anything," than turquoises standing with it could yield a figure even remotely appropriate for yellow-stained finger nails. גָּלִיל is rather roller, cylinder, rod, and the expression "golden rods" is applied primarily to the individual fingers with reference to their reddish lustre and finely rounded shape (comp. ver. 11 *a*) and then by synecdoche to the hands consisting of the fingers.*—**Encased in turquoises.** Whatever precious stone may be intended by תַּרְשִׁישׁ, whether the chrysolite of the ancients (see Septuag., Ex. xxviii. 17; xxxix. 13) which seems to answer to our topaz; or what is now called the turquoise (a light-blue semi-precious stone); or the onyx, which Hitzig proposes (though this was called שֹׁהַם Gen. ii. 12, *etc.*), it is at all events in bad taste to understand by this encasing of the fingers in costly jewels anything but actual jewel ornaments with which his hands glittered, agreeably to the well-known custom in the ancient East of wearing many rings. (Comp. Winer, *Realwörterb.*, Art., "*Ringe*" and "*Siegelring*"). The nails in and of themselves differed too little in color and lustre from the fingers and hands as a whole, to admit of their being compared with precious stones; and staining them with alhenna (comp. on i. 14) if practised at all in the time of Solomon, was most likely a custom restricted to women and which could scarcely have been likewise in use amongst men. On מִלֵּא in the sense of "encasing" (lit., to fill in the encasement or enclosure) comp. Ex. xxviii. 17; xxxi. 5; xxxv. 33. "Golden rods encased in turquoise" or "with turquoise" are properly such rods filled into the body of jewels here named *i. e.* surrounded and glittering with them (comp. Weissb. *in loc.*).—**His body a figure of ivory, veiled with sapphires.** מֵעָיו here, where the exterior parts of the body only are enumerated, is certainly not "his bowels, his inwards" (Hengstenberg), but "his body," comp. vii. 8, as well as Dan. ii. 32, where מְעִים also stands as a synonym of בֶּטֶן. It is only the pure white and the smooth appearance of the body, *i. e.* of the trunk generally, including the breast, thighs, *etc.*, which can be intended by the comparison with an עֶשֶׁת שֵׁן a "figure of ivory" (עֶשֶׁת sing. of עֶשְׁתוֹת [but see Gesen. *Lex.* s. v.—Tr.] forms, thoughts, Job xii. 5), a comparison in which that ivory work of art restored by Solomon according to 1 Kin. x. 18 may have been before the mind of the speaker. The sapphires veiling the statue are naturally a figure of the dress of sapphire-blue or better still of the dress confined by a splendid girdle studded with sapphires. On the latter assumption the apparent "unsuitableness of the comparison" vanishes, which certainly would have to be admitted (Hitz.) if the sapphire referred to the azure color of the dress. For it would evidently be too far-fetched, with Vaih. to refer the sapphire to the "blue veins appearing through the splendid white skin of the body," and this would neither comport with the deep blue color of the sapphire or lapis lazuli, nor with the expression "veiled, covered (מְעֻלֶּפֶת) with sapphires."—There is accordingly an indirect proof of the royal rank and condition of Shulamith's lover in the representations of this verse likewise, especially in its allusions to the ornaments of precious stones on the hands and about the waist of the person described.

Ver. 15. **His legs columns of white marble.** The figure of an elegant statue is here continued with little alteration. To understand the שׁוֹקַיִם simply of the lower part of the legs and to assume that Shulamith omits to mention the יְרֵכַיִם *i. e.* the upper part of the legs from a fine sense of decorum (Hitz.) is inadmissible, because שׁוֹקַיִם according to passages like Prov. xxvi. 7; Isa. xlvii. 2 appears to include the upper part of the leg, whilst יְרֵכַיִם according to Gen. xxiv. 2; Ex. xxviii. 42: Dan. ii. 32, *etc.*, denotes rather the loins or that part of the body where the legs begin to separate. Further, the mention of the legs and just before of the body could only be regarded as unbecoming or improper by an overstrained prudishness, because the description which is here given avoids all libidinous details and is so strictly general as not even to imply that she had ever seen the parts of the body in question in a nude condition. It merely serves to complete the delineation of her lover, which Shulamith sketches by a gradual descent from head to foot, and moreover is to be laid to the account of the poet rather than to that of Shulamith, who is in every thing else so chaste and delicate in her feelings.—The legs are compared with "white marble" (שֵׁשׁ) principally on account of

* [Thrupp: "His hands are folding panels of gold. The word גָּלִיל is applied, as we learn from 1 Kings vi. 34, to the separate portions of a folding door; the doors to the holy of holies consisted of two leaves, each of which in its turn consisted of two halves or folds. There is no passage in which the word denotes a 'ring;' nor would this meaning be here so appropriate. The image is that of a door, not necessarily a large door, constructed in four or five separate folds, corresponding to the appearance presented by the hand when the fingers, while kept in contact with each other, are stretched at full length."]

Digitized by Google

the lustrous color of their skin, not with reference to their solidity; for an Arabic poet (AMRU B KELTH., *Moal.* ver. 18) pictures even the legs of a girl as "pillars of marble and ivory;" and the figure of the marble column is also employed in a like sense by Greek poets and mythographers (comp. VAIH. *in loc.*). **Set on bases of fine gold,** *viz.*, on the feet which are here named as the bases or pedestals of the columns (their יְסוֹד) without however going into any further description of them.* **His aspect like Lebanon.** מַרְאֶה not synonymous with קוֹמָה "stature" (vii. 8), but denoting his entire appearance, his whole figure and bearing comp. ii. 14. By this comparison with Lebanon his figure is characterized as majestically tall and impressive, comp. Jer. xlvi. 18. There is probably no allusion to the "lordly look" which Lebanon bestows upon his beholders (*vs.* ROSENM., MAGN.), and still less likelihood of a reference to the roots of the mountain penetrating deeply and extending widely in the earth as analogous to the "roots of her lover's feet." Job xiii. 27; Hos. xiv. 6 (*vs.* HITZ.).—**Choice as the cedars**; that is, stately and majestic as these giant trees which crown the summit of Lebanon.

Ver. 16. **His palate (is) sweets.** חֵךְ is not the mouth for kissing (MAGN., BÖTTCH.) but the palate as an organ of speech, as in Job vi. 30; xxxi. 30; Prov. v. 3; viii. 7. HITZ. correctly: "It is speech which first betrays that the beautiful body described vers. 10–15 has a soul;" whilst WEISSB. in asserting that the palate is here regarded as an organ of breathing like the lips ver. 13, fails to perceive this advance from the corporeal to the spiritual and creates an unhandsome repetition. On the figure comp. Prov. xvi. 21; xxvii. 9.—**And he is altogether precious.** כֻּלּוֹ "all of him" combines in one the sum total of the ten corporeal excellencies enumerated in vers. 11–15 together with the last named endowment of a spiritual nature, and thus completes the portrait of her lover, whereupon there follows the general reference to the preceding description: "This is my beloved, and this my friend, ye daughters of Jerusalem."

5. CONCLUSION. *c.* THE QUESTION WHERE HER LOVER IS AND SHULAMITH'S ANSWER. VI. 1–3.

Ver. 1. **Whither has thy beloved gone,** *etc.* As in what precedes Shulamith had made no distinct declaration respecting the person of her lover, but only given an ideal description of his beauty, the women might still remain uncertain who and where he was. Hence this additional question, which like that in v. 9 is a question of curiosity and expresses some such sense as this: If then thy lover is a person of such extraordinary elegance and beauty, how could he have suffered you to be away from him? how could he have permitted you to become the wife of another so that you now must pine after him and seek longingly for him? At all events that particular in Shulamith's story of her dream, according to which her lover "had turned away, was gone," v. 6, determined the form of their question. The women may have thought that they perceived in this the echo of an actual occurrence, a sudden desertion of Shulamith by her former lover. Manifestly no one of them thought of Solomon as the object of her languishing and painful desire.

Ver. 2. **My beloved has gone down to his garden, to the beds of balm.** This answer of Shulamith is certainly evasive, but scarcely jesting and roguish (HITZ.); it is rather sadly ironical. She does not seriously mean to represent Solomon as actually occupied with working in the garden or with rural pleasures (as DEL. supposes). She merely intends to intimate that other matters seem more pressing and important to him than intercourse with her, his chosen love, and with this view she makes use of those pastoral and agricultural (horticultural) tropes, with which she is most conversant and most entirely at home (comp. i. 7, 14; ii. 3, 16, *etc.*) It is further probable that "going down to the beds of balm" and "gathering lilies" may contain an allusion to amorous intercourse meanwhile indulged with others of his wives; and with this the primarily apologetic drift of her whole statement, which is purposely figurative and ambiguous, might very well consist. What Shulamith here says can in no event refer to a lover of the rank of a shepherd; for it would be trifling and in bad taste to attribute to him in that case besides his main business of feeding his flock, that of being engaged with beds of balm and other objects belonging to the higher branches of gardening (comp. WEISSB. *in loc.*) and to explain the "garden" in the sense of iv. 12–15 (that is, of Shulamith herself, as the locked garden, which her country lover had now come to Jerusalem to visit) must be regarded as the extreme of exegetical subtilty, and can neither be brought into harmony with the verb יָרַד "has gone down" (for which we would then rather expect עָלָה "has come up"), nor with the plur. בַּגַּנִּים "in the gardens" (*vs.* HITZ., BÖTTCH., REN.).

Ver. 3. **I am my beloved's,** *etc.*—The partial transposition of the words as compared with ii. 16 is not due to chance, but is an intentional alteration: comp. iv. 2 with vi. 6; ii. 17 with viii. 14.—The connexion of the exclamation before us with ver. 2 is given by HITZIG with substantial correctness: "The words of ver. 2 are a rebuff to strangers concerning themselves about her lover; the averment in ver. 3 that they belong to one another, indirectly excludes a third, and is thus inwardly connected with ver. 2." With which it must nevertheless be kept in view that this present assertion is not made without, at the same time, feeling a certain pain at the infidelity of one so purely and tenderly beloved.*—

* (BURROWES: "These doubtless refer to the beauty of his sandals;" so GOOD, TAYLOR, WILLIAMS and others. This seems to be the better explanation notwithstanding GINSBURG's objection: "That it refers to his feet and not to his sandals is evident from vers. 11 and 14, where the head and the hands, the visible parts of the body, are described as golden; and it is but natural that the feet, the only remaining exposed parts, should also be described as golden.")

* [This is certainly a most extraordinary comment upon language which manifestly expresses nothing but the most entire confidence in Solomon's unabated attachment to herself while it reaffirms her own undivided attachment to him. The inconstancy of the bridegroom, which ZÖCKLER's preconceived scheme obliges him to assume, is contradicted in express terms by this verse, converts ver. 2 into an unmeaning evasion instead of the frank statement, whether literal or

Digitized by Google

The remark made by DEL. on this verse cannot be substantiated: "With these words, impelled by love and followed by the daughters of Jerusalem (?), she *continues on her way*, hastening to the arms of her lover" (similarly too WEISSB.). The text does not contain the slightest intimation of such a departure of Shulamith to look for him, and a consequent change of scene. Comp. above, No. 2.

6. SECOND SCENE. *a.* SOLOMON'S REITERATED PRAISE OF THE BEAUTY OF SHULAMITH, vers. 4–10. The simplest view of this scene is that all to ver. 10 incl. is an encomium pronounced by the king, who has meanwhile entered, upon his beloved, but hitherto somewhat neglected and consequently saddened wife Shulamith, whilst vers. 11, 12 is spoken by her, and vii. 1 by her alternately with the chorus. And the following explanation of the details will show that this is on all accounts the most satisfactory. We must reject, therefore, the views of EWALD, who puts the whole, even the colloquy, vi. 11 to vii. 1, into the mouth of Solomon, and consequently assumes but one speaker; of HITZIG, who makes the ladies of the court retire and the "shepherd" enter and speak, ver. 9; of BÖTTCHER, who besides introduces the queen mother likewise as a speaker in the words "she is the only one of her mother, the choice of her that bare her" (ver. 9 *a*); of UMBREIT, who takes ver. 10 to be the question of the poet, vers. 11 ff. the language of Shulamith walking sadly about in the king's nut garden; of MAGNUS, who breaks up the whole section into no less than five fragments, *etc.*

Ver. 4. **Fair art thou, my dear, as Tirzah, comely as Jerusalem.**—תִּרְצָה Tirzah ("delightful;" also the name of a woman, Numb. xxvi. 33, in the passage before us rendered εὐδοκία by the SEPT.) is certainly the subsequent residence of the kings in the northern kingdom, yet not here named as such along with Jerusalem, but as a remarkably beautiful and charming town in northern Palestine. Its mere name cannot possibly have afforded the reason of its being mentioned. It is much more likely that its location not far from Shunem (according to HITZ., in the territory of Issachar, the tribe of Baasha?) may have had some influence, since Solomon is elsewhere particularly fond of comparing his beloved with localities in the region of her home (iv. 1, 8, 11, 15; vii. 5, 6). Comp. moreover Introduction, § 3, Rem. 1.—The site of ancient Tirzah is no longer accurately known. K. FURRER, *Wanderungen, etc.*, p. 241, thinks that he saw it not far from Sichem (to the north of it and due west of Samaria), "on a charming green hill, part of which has a very steep descent;" but he has probably taken a locality considerably to the south for the ruins of the old royal city, probably Thulluza (three hours east of Shomron, one hour north of Mount Ebal), so explained also by ROBINSON. Comp. HERGT, *Palästina*, p. 410; L. VOELTER, Art. "Thirza," in ZELLER'S *Bibl. Wörterbuch*, and WINER, in *Realwörterbuch*.—Jeremiah also speaks of Jerusalem's comeliness, Lam. ii. 15.—HENGSTENB. makes the poet rise from Tirzah to Jerusalem as a still grander city; but this is contradicted by the fact that the predicate נָאוָה "comely," as appears from i. 5 compared with i. 8, is inferior to יָפָה "fair."—**Terrible as bannered hosts.**—אָיֹם from the same stem with אֵימָה "terror," is used Hab. i. 7 to designate the Chaldeans as a dreadful foe, and here, therefore, can only designate the person addressed as fearful, terrible, as is especially evident from the comparison with "armies" or "bannered hosts."—But why is Shulamith here said to be "terrible as bannered hosts" (which is only further unfolded in what follows, "turn away thine eyes from me, for they assault me")? Not because she was to be represented in a general way as triumphant over men, whose hearts she wounds and captivates by her glances, (GESEN.); much more likely, because she has exerted upon Solomon in particular, her ardent lover, a fearful power by those eyes of hers, which pierce the heart and vanquish all resistance (Ew., DÖPKE, DELITZSCH, and the great body of interpreters); but most likely of all because it was from those marvellously beautiful eyes a grave reproachful look had fallen upon him, because he had felt himself, as it were, called to account and chastised by the awe-inspiring innocence and purity of her look. HITZ. is substantially correct, only he makes the "chastising look" proceed from Shulamith still unmarried, who from love to her young shepherd acts coldly towards the king in his addresses. This explanation cannot be invalidated by the fact that the predicate "terrible as bannered hosts" recurs ver. 10 below, as the language of the ladies of the court, quoted by Solomon;* for in this quotation Solomon uses great freedom, as is shown by the extravagant comparisons with the sun, moon, and dawn of the morning (see *in loc.*).

Ver. 5. **Turn away thine eyes from me, for they have taken me by storm.**—By this must be substantially meant, as appears from the context, an influence proceeding from Shulamith's serious looks to the heart of her conscience-smitten husband, by which he was awed and abashed (comp. the parallels adduced by HITZ. from the Syr. and Arab. for the sense of terrifying), not the exciting of love to a passion-

figurative, which it plainly is, and imputes a meaning to ver. 1 which the words certainly do not contain, and which no one who was not pressed by the exigencies of a theory would ever imagine that he found there. If the unsuccessful search for her lover, which Shulamith reports, v. 6, 7, was only a troubled dream, it can create no surprise that in her waking moments she knows and is able to state in the general whither her beloved had gone, even if she were not certain in what particular spot in his extensive gardens he was then to be found. The allegorical sense commonly put upon these verses will appear sufficiently from the following citations: "Jerusalem being on an hill, they went down to the gardens; so Christ comes down from heaven spiritually into the congregation." WESTMINSTER ANNOTATIONS. "The garden which had been described in iv. 12—v. 1. The 'garden' refers to the Christian body in its unity, the 'gardens' denote its manifoldness; in the New Testament we read, as THEODORET remarks, alike of the Church and of the churches. Under the dispensation of the gospel, no less than under that of the older covenant, Christ nurtures His people in the purity of holiness. But He now not only feeds His flock among lilies, but also gathers lilies; gathers with joy and acceptance from His people those fruits of holiness which through the grace of His Spirit they are continually bringing forth." THRUPP.—TR.]

* [This can scarcely be characterized in any other way than as carrying a theory through regardless of difficulties which the plain words of the text may interpose. The expression "terrible as armies with banners" cannot mean one thing here and a different thing in ver. 10. As GOOD correctly remarks: "The artillery of the eyes is an idea common to poets of every nation." Comp. ANACREON, Od. ii., xvi.; MUSÆUS, *Hero et Leander*.—TR.]

Digitized by Google

ate ardor (Döpke), nor bewitching (Vaihinger), nor manifesting her resistless and victorious power over her lover (Delitzsch), *etc.*—**Thy hair is like a flock of goats**, *etc.* Comp. iv. 1 *b*. On ver. 6 comp. iv. 2. On ver. 7 comp. iv. 3 *b*. The omission in this passage* of the description of the lips and tongue contained in iv. 3 *a*, is simply to be explained from the abridged character of the present delineation, which is, as it were, but an abstract of the preceding, and since it was enough simply to remind his beloved of the encomiums passed upon her on her wedding day, might fitly be restricted to bare hints or a summary recapitulation. The opinion of Hengstenberg and Weissbach, that the number four is maintained as characteristic of the form of this abridged description, as the number ten in the larger one, imputes too whimsical a design to the poet. Far too artificial also Hitzig: The omission of iv. 3 *a* is to intimate "a brief pause" in the vain endeavors of the king to gain over the coy Shulamith, whereupon the voluptuous sensualist and inconstant "butterfly" suddenly breaks off after ver. 7, bethinking himself that there are other damsels yet (*Iliad* ix. 395 f.), and accordingly leaving the scene with the words, "Well, I have sixty queens and eighty concubines," *etc*, to make love, soon after (vii. 2 ff.) to another(!).

Ver. 8. **There are sixty queens and eighty concubines**, *etc.* That this exclamation is not "uttered aside," and indicative of the sudden breaking of the thread of the king's patience, who has thus far been vainly laboring with Shulamith (according to Hitzig's view, just stated), incontrovertibly appears, from its close connection with ver. 9, which nothing but the extreme of arbitrary criticism can sunder from it, and put into the mouth of the "shepherd." Accordingly, even Renan has not ventured to approve Hitzig's separation of ver. 9 from ver. 8, but has assigned both verses to the shepherd, who interrupts the king by singing them "from without!" But how could the praise of the "one dove," the "one perfect," *etc.*, contained in ver. 9, come from any other mouth than that which uttered the encomium upon the beauty of the king's beloved, beginning ver. 4! And again, how else could the way be prepared for the emphatic declaration: "My dove is one," *etc.*, but by this glance at the great number of the queens, concubines and virgins, who were all at the rich king's command, but all of whom he was ready to subordinate to that one! It is plain that one verse here sustains the other, and they are all to ver. 10 inclusive most intimately connected together like links in a chain, which cannot be broken. This has been seen by the majority even of the advocates of the shepherd-hypothesis, without their finding anything better here after all than a "last violent assault" upon Shulamith's innocence (Ew.), or a "new and heightened piece of flattery" (Vaih.), or a "thought adapted to win the heart and ensnare the refined feelings of Shulamith" (Böttch.), *etc.* On the relation of the numbers here given, "sixty queens" and "eighty concubines" of Solomon to the seven hundred queens and three hundred concubines, as stated (1 Kin. xi. 3, see Introduc., § 3, p. 12). The passage before us evidently contains a statement referable to an earlier period in Solomon's life, which must as surely have been correct for some fixed point of time (which it is true cannot now be accurately ascertained), as the much larger numbers of the book of Kings are to be reckoned historically accurate for Solomon's latest and most degenerate years.* For there is just as little necessity really for discrediting them as "very large statements in round numbers" (Hitzig), as there is for the attempt to bring out an approximate adjustment with the lower statements of this passage, by the change of 700 to 70, and of 300 to 30 (comp. Thenius on 1 Kin. *in loc.*). The accounts of ancient writers, as Plutarch (*Artax.* c. 27), Curtius (III. 3, 24), Athenæus (*Deipnos.* III. 1), respecting the size of the harem of the later Persian monarchs (*e. g.*, Artaxerxes Mnemon had 360 παλλακίδες; Darius Codomannus was accompanied by 360 pellices on his march against Alexander, *etc.*) are analogies, which, rightly weighed, make rather in favor of than against the credibility of the book of Kings in this matter. And although the harems of modern oriental rulers are often stated to be considerably smaller, so that *e. g.*, Shah Sefi of Persia, according to Olearius, had but three wives and three hundred concubines, Sultan Abdul Medjid, of Constantinople, something over three hundred and fifty wives, *etc.*, these accounts of a very recent period prove nothing respecting the customs and relations of a hoary antiquity. The seven hundred and three hundred of the book of Kings, as well as the sixty and eighty of this passage, may indeed be round numbers. This is favored to some extent in the former case by the circumstance that the total amounts to precisely one thousand, and in the latter by the popular and proverbial use of the numbers six, sixty (comp. Cic. *Verrin.* I. c. 125), six hundred (Ex. xiv. 7; Judg. xviii. 11; 1 Sam. xxvii. 2, and the well-known use of the lat. sexcenti). But both these numerical statements must at all events pass for approximately exact; and neither the hypothesis that 1 Kings, *loc. cit.* states the entire number of all the wives, both principal and subordinate, that Solomon had in succession (so *e. g.* Keil *in loc.*), nor the

* At least according to the Masoretic text; though the Septuag. insert the words iv. 3 *a* (Ὡς σπαρτίον κόκκινον χείλη σου, καὶ ἡ λαλιά σου ὡραία) here too in their proper place (between vers. 6 and 7). [But gratuitous insertions from parallel passages are too frequent in the Septuagint to warrant the suspicion of an omission from the currently received text].

* [Westminster Annotations: "It seems that Solomon writ this book of Canticles before he had his full number of wives; for he had many more after." Patrick (followed by Williams, Scott and Henry) supposes allusion not to Solomon's own wives, but to those of other princes, for the reason that "it is not at all likely that he had so many as are there mentioned, while his mind was filled with such divine raptures as these." Fry fancies that he finds here an argument for the idyllic hypothesis: "The passage before us contains a tacit intimation that though King Solomon's name and King Solomon's pen were made use of by the divine Inspirer of these Canticles to construct an allegory representative of the loves of Christ and His Church, very different loves from those of Solomon must be imagined as the archetype, even when in the exterior of the allegory, circumstances of royalty and circumstances connected with the Israelitish monarch are supposed. And it is for the same reason that though King Solomon is the undoubted author of these songs, he so frequently disrobes himself of his royal character, and speaks in the person of a shepherd, or leads us to contemplate some faithful pair in the humbler ranks of life"].

Digitized by Google

opinion that the "virgins without number" may afford the means of adjusting the difference between them, seems to be admissible. Against the latter resource even Hitzig remarks: "The above difference cannot be reconciled by means of the עלמות virgins; for these plainly constitute a third class, and one outside of the harem"—that is to say, merely maids of the court, attendants upon the harem, whom the king, if he had chosen, might likewise have exalted to be concubines. On Hengstenberg's allegorical explanation, according to which the "household of the heavenly Solomon" is here depicted, and consequently sixty and eighty = one hundred and forty, is to be taken as a mystical number,* see Introduction, p. 31.

Ver. 9. **My dove, my perfect is one**, comp. on v. 2. The opinion that אֲחֹתִי "my sister," which stands with יוֹנָתִי תַמָּתִי "my dove, my perfect" in the parallel passage v. 2, can have influenced the selection of אַחַת "one" in this place, is very improbable (vs. Weissb.).—**The only one of her mother, the choice one of her that bare her**. It follows, from the subsequent mention of Shulamith's little sister, viii. 8, that the predicate "only" here (as in Prov. iv. 3) is not to be taken literally, but in the tropical sense of "incomparable." On the combination of "mother" and "she that bare her," iii. 4, viii. 5. On the clause generally, Prov. iv. 8.—**Daughters saw her and called her blessed, queens and concubines and they praised her**. On the sentence comp. Prov. xxxi. 28, probably a free imitation of this passage. The "daughters" evidently correspond to the עֲלָמוֹת "virgins," ver. 8, as also the "queens and concubines" of that verse recur here, that they may expressly subordinate themselves to Shulamith, who is preferred above them. On account of this exact correspondence between this clause and ver. 8, it is incomprehensible how Hitz. can regard ver. 9 as spoken by the shepherd. Whence could he know that Solomon's queens and concubines had such an opinion of Shulamith? And how unnatural and far-fetched would such a remark about the uniqueness and all-surpassing loveliness of his beloved appear as the first exclamation of the shepherd immediately upon his coming to her! In the course of his familiar conversation with her he might appropriately say something of the sort, but not as the first word of his salutation.

Ver. 10. **Who is this that looks forth like the dawn?** If these words, like the exclamations iii. 6 and viii. 5, which likewise begin with מִי־זֹאת "who is this," had really been the opening of a new scene (as Rosenm., Döpke, Heiligst., Del., Vaih., Weissb., *etc.*, maintain, either supposing Solomon, or his courtiers and attendants, or the ladies of the court to be the speakers) they would have been preceded by a concluding formula like iii. 5 and viii. 4. Instead of this ver. 9 rather required to be further explained and supplemented in regard to Shulamith's being praised and pronounced blessed by Solomon's wives; a statement was still needed of what the אִשֵּׁר 'blessing' and הִלֵּל 'praising' of those women amounted to. And the thing of all others best adapted to this purpose, was a mention of that admiring praise, which according to iii. 6 ff. the ladies of the court bestowed upon Shulamith on her entry into Zion upon her wedding day. To this panegyric, of which he must have had mediate or immediate cognizance, Solomon here refers, though only in the way of inexact suggestion not of faithful reproduction (substantially correct Ew., B. Hirzel, Böttch., Hitz.).—הַנִּשְׁקָפָה lit. "looking down, gazing down" from a high position: comp. שָׁקַף in Judg. v. 28; Ps. xiv. 2; liii. 3; cii. 20; Lam. iii. 50. Reference is thus made to the prominent or exalted place occupied by Shulamith in the world of women. She outshines all others like the early dawn, which looks from heaven over the mountains down to the earth. Yes, like the sun and moon! Dawn, moon and sun are here, therefore, personified as it were, like the sun in i. 6 above. **Fair as the moon, pure as the sun.** בָּרָה here equivalent to spotless, bright-shining, comp. Ps. xix. 9; and on the silvery moon as an image of superior purity and beauty Job xxv. 5; xxxi. 26. Arabic poets also sometimes compare female beauty with the brightness of the moon *e. g. Hamasa* (ed. Schultens, p. 483.) "Then Lamisa appeared like the moon of heaven when it shines;" Motanebbi (Translation by Von Hammer, p. 29, 42, *etc.*) and others, comp. Döpke and Magn. *in loc.*)* The poetic expressions לְבָנָה "white" and חַמָּה "hot" for moon and sun, which are again combined in Isa. xxiv. 23, are particularly suited for the comparison, because they are both feminine and alike indicative of white and blazing radiance.—**Terrible as bannered hosts.** This concluding simile points to the identity of the person intended with the one described in ver. 4, and at the same time testifies to the identity of the speaker and against the sundering of this verse from the preceding.†

7. Continuation. *b.* Shulamith and the ladies of the court, vi. 11—vii. 1.

* [Thrupp gives a different view from the allegorical standpoint: "As regards the sixty and the eighty, we have of course in each case a definite number for an indefinite. The choice of the particular numbers seems to have been mainly dictated by a studied avoidance of the number seventy, to which a certain sacredness and completeness would have attached. It is no harmonious covenant-relationship, in which the queens and concubines stand to Christ: all is with them imperfect and wide of the mark. A directly opposite view is erroneously taken by Hengstenberg." Wordsworth exhibits the Archdeacon of Westminster in his comment: "The concubines are more numerous than the queens. May not this perhaps signify that the number of the members of sectarian congregations would be greater than that of the Church?" He had before remarked upon the fourscore concubines: "A state of things is here represented when schisms prevail in Christendom. The concubines represent Christian congregations which have some spiritual gifts and graces, but are not perfectly joined to Christ in the unity of the one faith and apostolic fellowship"].

* Here too belong the verses from Theocritus, *Id.* xviii. 26 ff.

"Ἀὼς ἀντέλλοισα καλὸν διέφαινε πρόσωπον,
Πότνια νὺξ ἅτε, λευκὸν ἔαρ χειμῶνος ἀνέντος,
Ὧδε καὶ ἁ χρυσέα Ἑλένα διεφαίνετ' ἐν ἁμῖν."

† [Doway note: "Here is a beautiful metaphor describing the church from the beginning. 'As the morning rising,' signifying the church before the written law; 'fair as the moon,' showing her under the written law of Moses; 'bright as the sun,' under the light of the gospel; and 'terrible as an army,' the power of Christ's church against its enemies."]

Digitized by Google

Some recent commentators take this particularly difficult little section to be a narration by Shulamith of something which she had previously experienced, in which she also repeats the language of others to her, together with her answer (HITZ., MEIER, *etc.*); NAEGELSB. (in REUTER's *Repert.* 1852, No. 10) on the contrary regards it as a reverie of Shulamith, in which she foreshadows to herself her reception by her country friends on her expected return to them; Ew. (and HAHN) a continuation of the discourse of Solomon, in which a colloquy between Shulamith and the ladies of the royal court is repeated; the majority of both the older and the later expositors, however, make of it an independent dialogue between Shulamith and the "daughters of Jerusalem," in which the verses vi. 11, 12 together with the words "what do you see in Shulamith" in vii. 1 are assigned to the former, and the remainder of vii. 1, to the latter. This last understanding of it is the only one which avoids the manifold difficulties and forced explanations with which each of those previously mentioned is chargeable.

Ver. 11. **To the nut-garden I went down.** According to the various interpretations put upon the entire section, these words are thought to contain either 1) Shulamith's answer to what is supposed to be the wondering question of the ladies of the court in ver. 10 (so DEL. and WEISSB.: she states to her noble auditors in these words not so much who she is, as why she had come down to the king's garden); or 2) the beginning of an account of what happened to her on the occasion of her being first brought to the king's court (Ew., UMBR., HITZ., VAIH., BÖTTCH., REN. *etc.*—all agreeing in this that Shulamith here begins to tell the story of her former "abduction" to the king's harem); or 3) the beginning of a dreamy description of what Shulamith would do after her return home (NAEGELSB. *loc. cit.*) or 4) the beginning of a statement of the way in which the daughter of Zion attained the high dignity which the words of the heavenly Solomon had ascribed to her, especially in vers. 9 and 10, (HENGSTENB.); or 5) the beginning of a recital by Solomon, in which he prophetically depicts the process of the conversion of the gentiles to the God of Israel (HAHN) *etc.* We hold that of these views the second comes nearest to the true sense of the poet, but prefer to find in the words instead of a statement of what Shulamith was doing at the precise moment of her "abduction," a description of what she was in the habit of doing before she came to the royal court. We accordingly take יָרַדְתִּי neither as pluperf. ("I had gone down"), nor as a proper perfect, nor as an aorist, but as a statement of an action frequently repeated in the past, a customary action, in which sense though it elsewhere belongs rather to the future, the perfect is sometimes used in the O. T (*e. g.* 2 Sam. i. 22,) comp. Ew. *Lehrb.* § 136, *c.*—If, therefore, Shulamith commences in this way to describe her rural occupations prior to her exaltation as queen, she thereby gives her husband plainly enough to understand that he has in no wise satisfied her by his enthusiastic laudations and admiring declarations of love, but that she now longed more than ever to get away from his voluptuous court and from the vicinity of his sixty queens and eighty concubines to the green little nut garden, the fresh valleys and the lovely vineyards in the region of her home.—גִּנַּת אֱגוֹז denotes according to all the versions as well as to ancient Talmudic tradition a "nut garden," a meaning for which there is the less need to substitute "kitchen-herb or vegetable garden" (with HITZ.) since אֱגוֹז is doubtless the same word with the Pers. *ghuz* and JOSEPHUS *Bell. Jud.* III. 10, 8, expressly testifies to the occurrence of nut-trees in the region of the lake of Tiberias, not far consequently from Shulamith's home. The nut-garden here mentioned is to be sought in this her native region and not in the neighborhood of Jerusalem or within the range of the king's gardens. It can scarcely be different from the vineyards and orchards described vii. 13 ff. in the immediate vicinity of the house of Shulamith's mother.—**To look at the shrubs of the valley,** *etc.* The garden itself probably lay likewise in this valley-bottom, or at all events considerably lower than Shulamith's residence (hence ירד "went down"). "Shrubs" or "green" of the valley (אִבֵּי הַנָּחַל) probably denotes whatever verdure sprouted up in the place where the water of the Wady had run off, less likely the green of proper water-plants (Job viii. 12). On the combination of verdure or shrubs, vines and pomegranates comp. ii. 12, f. the like juxtaposition of flowers, fig trees and vines. רָאָה בְּ "to look at anything" denotes, as it invariably does, the pleased, gratified contemplation of an object (comp. Ps. xxvii. 4, lxiii. 3; Mic. iv. 11, *etc.*) not the busy looking for something, for which latter sense not even Gen. xxxiv. 1 can be adduced (vs. HITZ.).

Ver. 12. **I knew it not, my desire brought me,** *etc.* The thing intended is scarcely her "desire to walk out in the open air" (Ew.), or her "curiosity" (VAIH.), or her "wish to see the vine sprout" (HITZIG), but much more probably her desire to belong to her royal lover, her longing to be wholly and for ever her beloved's. When and how this desire was first awakened in her, she does not here state; she had given utterance to this in another place, see ii. 8-17. In the passage before us she simply assumes the existence of her desire and longing for her lover, and only tells how little she knew or imagined in the midst of those rural occupations of hers (ver. 11) that she was exalted by it "to the chariots of her people, the noble," in other words, how little she suspected beforehand that her lover was the king, the ruler of all Israel.—**To the chariots of my people, the noble.** מַרְכְּבוֹת strictly denotes merely "wagons," but here, like the combination "horses and chariots" in other passages (Deut. xx. 1; Isa. xxxi. 1; Ps. xx. 8) seems to express the idea of the full display of the power and pomp of the kingdom, but without suggesting anything of a military nature, so that as in 1 Sam. viii. 11; 2 Sam. xv. 1 we are to think chiefly of state carriages in the festive processions of the king and his court. Being transferred or promoted to these chariots of state would accordingly be tantamount to elevation to

Digitized by Google

royal dignity and glory, of which the analogy of Joseph in Egypt is an instructive instance, Gen. xli. 43 ff. So far as the language is concerned, there is no special objection to this interpretation. The connection of the accusative מַרְכְּבוֹת with the verb שׂוּם without a preposition most probably expresses the idea of "removing or bringing in the direction (comp. Isa. xl. 26; Dan. xi. 2; or into the vicinity of something." (comp. Judg. xi. 29); this is the case not merely with verbs denoting motion, but with all possible verbal ideas (see numerous examples in Ew., § 281, *d*). שׂוּם is often elsewhere synonymous with הֵבִיא "to bring or conduct to any place" (comp. Gen. ii. 8) and so שׂוּם מַרְכְּבוֹת may very readily mean: "to bring to the chariots, to transfer, exalt into the sphere or region of the chariots"—a meaning which is at all events more obvious than the rendering "to set me on the chariots" (Syr., Del., *etc.*); or than the explanation of Velth., Gesen., Ew., Böttch., Hitz., Ren., *etc.*: "made me happen *among* the chariots" (*viz.*, of the royal retinue); or than the strange rendering of the Vulg., which probably presupposes the reading שִׁמְּתַנִי instead of שָׂמַתְנִי "*conturbavit me propter quadrigas*," *etc.*; or finally than construing מַרְכְּבוֹת as a second object, either in the sense of "making me or converting me into chariots," *i. e.*, "a princess" (Umbr.) or "a defence" (Hengstenb.); or "making like chariots, *i. e.*, as swift as chariots" (Rosenm., Magn., Döpke). Since no one of these constructions appears to be better established in point of language than ours, while this latter undoubtedly yields a less forced and more attractive thought, we might with all confidence declare it to be the only one that was admissible, if it were not that the difficult limiting genitive עַמִּי נָדִיב "of my people, the noble," involves the real meaning of מַרְכְּבוֹת and consequently of the entire passage in an obscurity that can scarcely be cleared up. The translation "chariots of my people, the noble," or "chariots of my noble people," is on the whole the most satisfactory (the absence of the article before the adjective is of no consequence, comp. Gen. xliii. 14; Ps. cxliii. 10 [Green's *Heb. Gram.*, § 249, 1, *b*]). The resulting sense cannot then be materially different from that of נְדִיבֵי עָם "nobles of the people" Ps. cxiii. 8 or נְדִיבֵי הָעָם Num. xxi. 18 (comp. נְדִיבֵי עַמִּים Ps. xlvii. 10) and will accordingly refer to the noble countrymen of Shulamith, to the *proceres seu optimates gentis suæ*; for the explanation "war-chariots of the people of the prince" (Weissb.) certainly has as much against it as the opinion that עַמִּי נָדִיב is one noun, either equivalent to "prince of the realm" (Vaih.) or = the well-known proper name Amminadab (Ex. vi. 23; Num. i. 7; Ruth iv. 19; 1 Chron. ii. 10; vi. 7, *etc.*). This last expedient, manifestly the most confusing of all, was already tried by the Sept., Symmach., Vulg., Luther (who has Amminadib instead of Amminadab), and after them by most of the older interpreters, especially the allegorizers, with whom it was, so to speak, a fixed dogma that Amminadab means the devil! But even if we shun such devious ways, the sense of the expression "transferred to the chariots of my noble people" remains obscure and ambiguous enough, and we can either assume that the "noble people" or "noble folk" "*Edelvolk*" (Ew.) was intended to denote the noble extraction of Israel, or the courtiers of Solomon, or the whole people as represented in the person of its prince (so substantially Del., comp. Vaih.). In all which, however, it still remains a question why the poet did not make Shulamith speak in so many terms of her elevation to the chariot or to the throne of her prince.—To complete as far as possible our enumeration of all that interpreters have made out of the crux before us, Weissbach's view of this verse may here be stated in conclusion. According to it "the words of ver. 12 in the mouth of the person, who had proposed the question ver. 10 (*viz.*, a courtier, who had gazed with astonishment upon Shulamith in the garden) mean: I asked the question because I did not know that this brilliant and majestic spectacle was you; I had rather supposed that I saw the prince's army chariots before me!"—Hahn, too, thinks that the speaker of these words is not Shulamith but Solomon, who thus relates how, when filled with longing desire for a reunion with Japhetic gentilism, his soul suddenly and insensibly set him "on the chariots of his people as a prince."*

Chap. 7, Ver. 1. **Come back, come back, Shulamith,** *etc.* As according to our understanding of vers. 11 and 12 Shulamith expresses in them her longing for the simpler circumstances of her native region and speaks of her elevation to the king's throne as a distinction, which came to her without her knowledge, and contrary to her expectation, nothing is more natural than to conceive that she spoke this in a saddened and painfully excited mood, and

* [The simplest and most natural explanation of these words finds in them, as it is expressed by Wordsworth: "the cheerful alacrity and fervent affection of the bride flying on the wings of love" to the bridegroom. Moody Stuart: "In a moment her soul is carried away directly, irresistibly, rapidly toward her bridegroom and her king." Withington thus paraphrases: "I went into the garden; I walked among its shades; I surveyed its beauties; I remembered the owner, and my soul melted with rapture and love." Patrick makes a somewhat different application: "The meaning of this verse seems to be that the spouse hearing such high commendations of herself, both from the bridegroom and from the persons mentioned, ver. 10, with great humility saith, that she was not conscious to herself of such perfections (I did not know it, or I did not think so), but is excited thereby to make the greatest speed to endeavor to preserve this character he had given her." Percy and Good understand it of the bride's hesitation and irresolution after she had promised to meet her beloved in the garden. The latter states its meaning thus: "I was not aware of the timidity of my mind, which hurried me away from my engagement, when in the very act of adhering to it, with the rapidity of the chariot of Amminadib." Thrupp on the basis of 2 Kings ii. 12; xiii. 14: "The church had unconsciously and unexpectedly become the source and channel of victorious might to all the willing people of God. 'My soul,' she says, 'had made me.' It is the unshrinking and devoted zeal with which the church prosecutes the task set before her that makes her the rallying point for all who would join in the service of her Lord." Others attribute this language to the bridegroom. Thus Taylor and Williams: "The affections of the prince carried him to meet his love with the rapidity of a chariot." Burrowes, as Scott and Henry, finds in vers. 11–13 a statement of the feelings of the bridegroom during his temporary withdrawal. When he left his spouse, v. 6, it was "only to withdraw to his favorite place of resort in the garden;" where "almost unconsciously, ere he was aware, his soul was filled with the desire of meeting her again, a desire so strong that it would have carried him to her arms with the swiftness of the chariot of Amminadib." It is characteristic of Gill's exposition that in commenting on ver. 11 he proposes the question, Why are believers like nuts? and answers it under ten heads.]

Digitized by Google

to conjecture that her strong and painful feeling of home-sickness would be accompanied by a corresponding gesture. This gesture we must unquestionably suppose from the earnest and repeated call addressed to her by the ladies of the court "come back, turn back" (שׁוּבִי שׁוּבִי comp. Judg. v. 12) was that of intending to go away, to escape from the vicinity of the vicious court of the king, which had become offensive to her. She does not purpose to withdraw from the "king's garden" (Döpke, Delitzsch, *etc.*), in which besides she could scarcely have been at the time, but from the vicinity of the king altogether, who had greatly grieved her, and that of the ladies of his court, whose society she feels that she must henceforth avoid. Hence it is that the latter (for it is to them that Shulamith's answer "what do you see in Shulamith?" is directed) call to her, entreating her to turn again and permit them still to look upon her charming person. For this is the only sense in which וְנֶחֱזֶה בָּךְ "that we may look upon thee" (חָזָה בְ not materially different from רָאָה בְ vi. 11) can be taken, *viz.:* that of beholding with delight, feasting the eyes upon her to whom they had long before accorded the praise of beauty (comp. their frequent form of address, "fairest among women," i. 8; v. 9; vi. 1). That it is the ladies of the court, who address to her this summons to return and remain, and not Solomon (whom many of the older commentators regard as the speaker in these words, see Starke), is either to be explained by Solomon's uniting in the call of the women (comp. Döpke, Ewald, *etc.*), or better still by the assumption that he who was more affected than all others by her attempt to go away, does more than barely call her back, he seeks by loving force to detain her; and hence, speechless with passionate emotion, he first embraces and holds her, that he may afterwards fetter her by the fondest adulation* (ver. 2 ff.).—**What do you see in Shulamith?** This question asked by the party addressed is doubtless to be understood as modestly declining the praise indirectly bestowed upon her beauty in thus calling her. Shulamith wishes to be no longer looked at and admired by such people as Solomon's concubines and the ladies of his court; this has become oppressive to her. The humility of her entire question certainly characterizes also her designation of herself בַּשּׁוּלַמִּית (lit., "in the Shulamitess," *i. e.* not "in this Shulamitess" but "in one who is a Shulamitess;" comp. 1 Kin. xx. 36; Isa. vii. 14; Joel iv. 3, *etc.*). Its meaning is certainly no other than "why do you look at me, a plain country girl (Hitzig)? what you see in the simple daughter of a Galilean village?" הַשּׁוּלַמִּית is, as the article shows both here and where it was used in the vocative, certainly not the proper name of a person (so most of the ancient versions and interpreters); no more is it an adjective meaning "favored, treated with kindness" (Weissb.), but a gentile noun, synonymous with הַשּׁוּנַמִּית 1 Kin. i. 3; 2 Kin. iv. 12, 25, of which it is only a dialectic variation; it is accordingly a designation of the person in question from שׁוּלֵם or שׁוּנֵם, the place of her abode.* This place, the Σουλήμ of Eusebius and Jerome in his *Onomast.* and the modern *Sôlam* appears to have received its name, which originally may have been = סֻלָּם "ladder," on account of its location on a steep mountain declivity (comp. Robinson, *Pal.* II. 234), just as many other mountains, *e. g.* that mentioned 1 Mac. xi. 59 bear the name Κλῖμαξ (comp. Hitzig *in loc.* and "*Urgeschichte der Philister,*" p. 126). According to Josh. xix. 18 this Shunem was situated in the tribe of Issachar, according to 1 Sam. xxviii. 4; xxix. 1, 11; xxxi. 1 not far from Mount Gilboa and the plain of Jezreel, according to 2 Kin. iv. 22–25 not very remote from Mount Carmel (comp. on ver. 6 of this chapter, and above on ii. 8; iii. 6; iv. 1, 8; also the Introduction, p. 6). **As the dance of Mahanaim.** Some interpreters after the example of the Vulg. ("*quid videbis in Sulamite, nisi choros castrorum?*") connect the difficult words כִּמְחֹלַת הַמַּחֲנָיִם with the question "why will ye look upon Shulamith, as one looks upon the dance of Mahanaim?" (Hahn, Weissb., Renan, *etc.*,) or "as at the dance of M." (Hitzig). But it seems more natural and better suited to the context with the majority of both the older and more recent commentators, to regard these words as the answer to the question of Shulamith, given of course by those who had asked her to return, and who take this mode of stating why they were in fact so much concerned to see Shulamith yet longer. They see in her "something that resembles the dance of Mahanaim," something as magnificent and transporting as the dance of the angel-host, east of the Jordan on

* [The abruptness with which this verse is introduced and the ambiguity of some of its expressions make its meaning extremely doubtful and have led to a variety of uncertain conjectures, but do not justify the acceptance of the incredible sense here put upon it. According to the view which is entertained of the context it has been supposed to be addressed to the bride, who was rising to leave the speakers (Taylor), or had been borne away from them by her inward rapture figuratively described in the preceding verse (Moody Stuart), or who had parted from them in company with her husband (Patrick), or who was timidly shrinking from meeting him (Williams, Good, the latter of whom renders thus: "Virgins.—'Return, return, O bride of Solomon! Return, return, that we may yet respect thee.' Royal Bride.—'What do you expect from the bride of Solomon?' Virgins.—'Fortitude, like the conflict of two armies'"). Or it is thought to be a call upon the bride to return from her alienation to her husband (Ainsworth, Burrowes, as well as Wordsworth, who thinks that the iteration of the appeal denotes a summons "to both Jew and Gentile to return to God and to one another in Christ and His Church"), or to return in peace from victorious conflict (Thrupp, who compares Josh. x. 21; Judg. viii. 9; xi. 31; 1 Kin. xxii. 28).—Tr.]

* [The article as well as the form of the noun certainly favor its derivation from the place of her birth or residence. The chief objections to it are, first that Shunem is never called Shulem in the Bible but always Shunem and its inhabitants Shunammites; and secondly, the bride is called a prince's daughter, vii. 2. The derivation from Solomon (to which Clarke compares Charlotte from Charles, Henrietta from Henry, *etc.*), is favored by most English commentators, and still divides the suffrages of the learned, though it does not satisfactorily account for the form of the name nor explain the presence of the article. Its derivation from Salem in the sense of Jerusalem, as though it were equivalent to Jerusalemite, as Gill and others suggest after Kimchi and Aben Ezra is utterly inadmissible. Others follow the example of Aquila (εἰρηνεύουσα) and attribute to it an appellative sense as derived from the root שָׁלֵם; so Patrick: "perfect," and Thrupp: "The peace-laden, lit., the bepeaced. The name is derived from the same root as Solomon and stands in partial correspondence with it."—Tr.]

Digitized by Google

Jacob's return home to the promised land. See Gen. xxxii. 1–3, to which passage there is an unmistakable allusion here as DÖPKE, DELITZSCH, HENGSTENB., MEIER, *etc.*, correctly assume. This occurrence in the early patriarchal history as celebrated as Jacob's wrestling at Peniel (Gen. xxxii. 28, comp. Hos. xii. 4 ff.), this miraculous experience of the patriarch Jacob, to which the town of Mahanaim between Jabbok and the Jordan, the royal residence of the anti-Davidic northern kingdom under Ishbosheth (2 Sam. ii. 8 ff.) owed its name, forms here the point of comparison and is evidently intended to represent the sight of Shulamith as of angelic beauty and heavenly sublimity, just as she had before been compared with the morning dawn, the sun and moon (vi. 10), and in agreement with the fact that in other passages dances in praise of God are attributed both to the stars and to the angels of God (comp. Job xxxviii. 7; Judg. v. 20; Ps. ciii. 21; cxlviii. 2; 1 Kings xxii. 19; Luke ii. 13, *etc.*). The "dance of Mahanaim" is accordingly the well-known dance of the angels on the site where Mahanaim subsequently stood. It is not necessary to take הַמַּחֲנָיִם in its appellative sense "dance of the angel choirs" (DÖPKE) or "the angelic hosts" (GESEN.) or "the angel-camps" (DEL.) or "the double army" (UMBR., WEISSB.; comp. the TARG. *in loc.*). We must, however, decidedly reject every interpretation of these words, which sees in them an "invitation to dance," whether it is Solomon (so BÖTTCHER), or the ladies of the court (EW., DELITZSCH, *etc.*), or Solomon and his companions (DÖPKE), who are supposed to make request of Shulamith to execute the famous dance of Mahanaim in their presence. Such a dance, whether it be regarded as a solemn festive dance, in which several took part (EWALD, BÖTTCHER, *etc.*), or as a contra-dance of two ranks, one consisting of young men, and the other of young women (HITZIG), or as a solo dance by a "danseuse of the Harem" (REN.), or as a "country festival dance in the simple attire of a shepherdess or a vine-dresser" (DEL.) is as devoid of evidence for its historical existence, as it is impossible to demonstrate from the present context that it was in this instance actually performed. And if actually exhibited on the stage, and described in the terms that follow (ver. 2 ff.), it certainly would not have afforded that "most chaste spectacle," that "indication of Shulamith's humility and childlike disposition" which DELITZSCH professes to see in it; comp. above No. 2, p. 94.

8. CONCLUSION. *c.* SOLOMON'S FINAL LAUDATION OF THE BEAUTY OF HIS BELOVED, vii. 2–6. DELITZSCH alone has put this description into the mouth of the daughters of Jerusalem instead of that of Solomon [so TAYLOR, GOOD, WILLIAMS, FRY, PATRICK, AINSWORTH and others on the ground chiefly that the king is spoken of in the third person, ver. 5], against which, however, may be urged not only the sameness of the tone, which prevails in this as in the following brief section (vers. 7–10), but also the circumstance that the caressing speeches here go further in one point at any rate, and to say the least, are more undisguised than could have been expected from the mouth of women (see ver. 3). This description of the beauty of Shulamith also has the greatest similarity to those which Solomon had previously given (iv. 1 ff.; vi. 4 ff.), only it enumerates her various charms in the reverse order, by ascending from the feet to the head, and thus proceeds in conformity with the customary Hebrew phrase "from the foot to the head" (2 Sam. xiv. 25; Isa. i. 6). That this inverted order of the description was not occasioned by the person described executing a dance, but simply arose from the poet's desire for variety, is correctly recognized even by HITZIG; comp. also EWALD *in loc.* (vs. DELITZSCH, VAIH., RENAN and others). One point of contact with a preceding passage of like character in the poem is found in the ten beautiful parts of the body, which are here adduced as in Shulamith's description of the charms of her lover (v. 10–16).—**How beautiful are thy steps in the shoes, O prince's daughter!** That the beginning is made with the steps (פְּעָמִים comp. Ps. lviii. 11; 2 Kings xix. 24), *i. e.*, with the feet as stepping, as in motion, proves nothing in favor of the dancing hypothesis already rejected. For "to step" is not = "to dance," and Shulamith must have taken some steps at the beginning of this description, inasmuch as Solomon must have led her back to his or to her former position, or have conducted her to some seat after her purpose to go away. In doing so he points out to her her graceful and charming "steps in her shoes," or in other words how very becoming the shoes, which she wears as a "prince's daughter," are to her as she walks! The shoes are manifestly mentioned as something which she did not wear originally and in common (comp. v. 3), as a constituent, therefore, of her new and elegant court dress, which had doubtless been prepared in a most luxurious manner, both in material and style, and probably were ornamented with bows of purple, yellow or variegated ribbons, like the showy sandals of noble Hebrew women in later times (comp. Ezek. xvi. 10; Judith x. 9; WINER *R.-W.-B.*, Art. "*Schuhe*"). She is at the same time designated a "prince's daughter" or "noble daughter" in order to indicate her present high rank (not her noble descent, which according to i. 6; ii. 8 ff., vi. 11 is improbable). בַּת is here used in a wide sense for female in general, to mark the fem. gender, as ii. 2; vi. 9; Gen. xxx. 13; Judg. xii. 9, *etc.*; and the term נָדִיב "noble" may have been suggested by the עַמִּי נָדִיב which she had used just before. That this form of address is substantially synonymous with "my sister bride" has already been observed on iv. 9 above. **Thy rounded thighs are like jewels.** Lit., "the roundings of thy thighs," *i. e.*, the rounded parts which constitute thy thighs (יְרֵכַיִךְ genit. of the material [GREEN'S *Heb. Gram.*, § 254, 4] as Ps. xl. 16: lxviii. 31, *etc.*—The word חֲלָאִים is very variously explained "necklace" or "jewels" (SEPT., VULG., SYR., ROSENM., MAGN., VAIH., BÖTTCHER), "clasps" (EW.), "pearls" (HITZIG), "ornaments" (HENGSTENB.), or "ornamental chains." As is shown by the singular חֲלִי, חֶלְיָה, which occurs Prov. xxv. 12; Hos. ii. 15, some elegantly made ornament must be intended, and according to the passage before us it must be composed of round, smoothly turned globules or pearls, as it is used to set forth the perfectly

Digitized by Google

rounded shape of the thighs.—**The work of an artist's hands.** The sing. מַעֲשֵׂה, which the SEPT. and SYR. correctly retain, is here employed because the numerous globules or pearls strung together, form but one whole, one necklace. The form אָמָּן, of the same signification with אָמוֹן Prov. viii. 30, and with the Chald. and Syr. אוּמָּן (see HITZIG *in loc.*, and EWALD, *Lehrbuch*, § 152 *b*) serves to denote the artificer or artist (*τεχνίτης, artifex*) in contrast with the חָרָשׁ (*τέκτων, faber*) workman who only performs the coarser kind of work. That a skilful turner is here particularly intended appears from חֲלָאִים. The rotundity of the thighs is one of the noted beauties of the female figure, not merely according to Oriental, but also according to Grecian taste, as is shown by the well-known attribute of Aphrodite *καλλίπυγος*.

Ver. 3. **Thy navel is a round bowl.** שֹׁרֶר according to the unanimous testimony of the old translators = שֹׁר Ezek. xvi. 4, and = Arab. *surr, i. e.*, "navel" (comp. on Prov. iii. 8). But, as we learn from the comparison with a round bowl or mixing vessel (on אַגָּן see just below), as well as from the following wish that this vessel may not lack mingled wine, the navel itself as such cannot be intended, but rather the whole belly (abdomen) with the navel as its centre. Correctly therefore HAHN, VAIH., WEISSBACH, *etc.*, "*dein Schooss*," (*thy lap*) by which expression the reference demanded by what follows is sufficiently intimated, whilst the translation "*pudenda*" (MAGNUS, DÖPKE, HITZIG) cannot be justified on linguistic grounds; for both שָׁרִיר Job xl. 16, and the Arab. *sirr* (*αἰδοῖον, arcanum*) are only related, not identical ideas.—אַגָּן plur. אַגָּנוֹת (Isa. xxii. 24; Ex. xxiv. 6) does not denote a cup, but rather a bowl, a large round drinking vessel, here doubtless a bowl for mixing (*κρατήρ*, SEPT., VULG.) as the following מֶזֶג "mixed wine" shows. For that they prepared this drink (a mixture of wine with warm or cold water—*Berachoth* 7, 5; 8, 2: *Pesach* 7, 13; *Maasser* 4, 4) exclusively in smaller vessels as cups, goblets, *etc.*, can scarcely be proved by the formula מָזוּג אֶת־הַכּוֹס (vs. HITZIG).—**Let not mixed wine be lacking.** This wish, which is not to be converted with the older interpreters into an objective statement, as "*nunquam indigens poculis*" VULG.) or "to which drink is never wanting" (LUTHER), contains without doubt an allusion of like nature, but not so delicate as that contained in v. 12 ff.* (comp. Prov. v. 15 ff.). Some modern commentators vainly seek by various methods to escape this admission, *e. g.*, BÖTTCHER by the assumption that this wish was only designed to set forth in a vivid manner the circular form of the navel; HENGSTENB. by the allegorizing remark: "the capacity of the church to revive the thirsty with a noble refreshing draught is represented under the emblem of a bowl always full of mixed wine;" DEL. by the assertion: "The navel in so far as it became visible through her dress as she breathed harder in dancing (?) was like a circular cup which was not lacking in spiced wine" (but אַל with the following voluntative or jussive future!), "*i. e.*, as full of blooming health (Prov. iii. 8) as that of spiced wine."—**Thy body is a heap of wheat, set around with lilies.**—עֲרֵמַת חִטִּים is certainly not a "sheaf of wheat" (EWALD, who here has in mind Ruth iii. 7, where, however, עֲרֵמָה rather means a heap of sheaves), but an accumulated heap of grain (comp. 2 Chron. xxxi. 6 ff.; Neh. iii. 34), so that the point of comparison lies on the one hand in its being arched over, and on the other in its yellowish-white color, and perhaps also subordinately in the fruitfulness of such a heap of grain. "Set around with lilies" appears to allude to the custom of "garnishing with flowers such a heap of wheat on the floor, when they threshed the grain in the open field immediately after the harvest" (DÖPKE),—a custom which, to be sure, has to be inferred solely from this passage. That the whole is a mere "fancy picture" (WEISSB., HITZIG) is improbable. Yet the comparison was probably suggested by the lily-red—we would have to say the rose-red—color of her dress which chastely and modestly covered, as it should, the body of the young lady, just as in v. 14 the sapphires enveloping the "ivory figure" indicated the color of the garment. At all events

* [There is no reason for suspecting an indelicacy in this perfectly harmless expression. Neither the words employed, the mode of their employment, nor the connection in which they stand warrant such an imputation. NOYES correctly says the "spiced wine" is "mentioned merely to set off the beauty and richness of the cup." MOODY STUART: "The dress of the bride is described throughout, except where clothing is not worn, as on the neck and the face. The proof of this is ample and irresistible in the very first line of the picture—the feet 'beautiful with shoes.' The person might have been clothed, while the feet were unshod; but it was impossible that the feet should be beautified with the finest sandals, without the whole person being arranged as a bride adorned for her husband. Both the terms, therefore, in this verse are of necessity parts of dress covering the corresponding parts of the person, according to the tendency in all languages to transfer the names that designate the living body to the dress that both conceals and adorns it. There is a great agreement of critics, as well as obvious suitableness in interpreting the goblet of wine as an image of the clasp that secures the girdle, composed probably of rubies to which wine is often compared." So substantially also PATRICK, HARMER, PARKHURST, TAYLOR, WILLIAMS, and others. GOOD, on the contrary, objects to the opinion "that the royal poet, instead of delineating the personal charms, 'the unbought graces' of his accomplished fair, is merely describing her different habiliments with the splendid figures which were wrought on them. Against such an interpretation I cannot but strongly protest, as equally unpoetical, and unjust to the text. In the literal sense of the original, I see no indelicacy whatever, and there ought to be no indelicacy in its translation. The royal bard is merely assuming a liberty, and that in the chastest manner possible, which we are daily conceding in our age to every painter and sculptor of eminence." GOOD coincides in opinion with ZÖCKLER, that "navel" is here used in a wide sense for "the whole of the surrounding region," and proposes the rendering "waist." Adopting this suggestion, BURROWES presents the following picture as his conception of the figure here described: "First, the feet more beautiful in the elegant sandals; then the contour, the folds of the bridal dress falling around the hips, graceful as the curvature of a rich necklace wrought by a finished hand; next, the body like a heap of wheat encompassed with lilies; then, the waist expanding into the bosom, elegant as a goblet rounded gracefully upwards, and filled with the richest spiced wine." SCOTT: "Comeliness of person, not richness of attire or ornament, is intended; otherwise the commendations would be equally appropriate to the most deformed, if splendidly attired, as to the most beautiful; nor is there any need to remove the garments in order to distinguish a very well proportioned and comely person from others in the most ordinary intercourse of life. Either men or women may disguise themselves by decoration; but becoming raiment sets off the form of those who wear it."]

Digitized by Google

the characteristic feature, and the chief significance, perhaps, of the entire figure lies not in this subsidiary matter of setting it around with lilies, but in the heap of grain. Approximate parallels are adduced by DÖPKE, MAGN., *etc.*, *e. g.*, a passage from MOTANEBBI (v. HAMMER, p. 74), where the loins of a girl are likened to a sand-hill; OMMONRHEIF (*Hamasa*, in REISKE *Taraf.*, p. 53), "*Nates habet ut tumulos arenæ rore compactæ;*" NUWEIRIUS (*loc. cit.*, p. 131): "*Poetæ comparant nates amatæ cum collibus arenaceis.*"

Ver. 4. **Thy two breasts are like two young roes,** *etc.*—Comp. iv. 5. "Feeding among the lilies" is omitted here, because the figure of lilies had just been employed with a somewhat different application; not from regard to ver. 9, which has nothing to do with "feeding" either in figure or in fact (vs. WEISSBACH).

Ver. 5. **Thy neck is like a tower of ivory.**—The tert. comp. lies on the one hand in its being slender and straight, and on the other in the pure white skin of the neck; it is therefore similar, though not exactly like that in iv. 4. The ivory tower here mentioned is certainly different from the tower of David named there, inasmuch as it is not to be conceived of as a tower for defence or an arsenal, but without doubt a structure designed for purposes of luxury, like Ahab's ivory house (1 Kings xxii. 39; comp. Am. iii. 15; Ps. xlv. 9), or like the ivory throne, on which Solomon sat, according to 1 Kings x. 18 ff.—**Thine eyes pools in Heshbon.**—As v. 12 the eyes of the lover are compared with "doves by brooks of water, bathing in milk, sitting on fullness," so here the eyes of his beloved are likened to light blue pools or basins of water, which charmingly mirror back the rays of the sun. Comp. OVID, *de arte amat.*, II., 722:—"*oculos tremulo fulgore micantes, ut sol a liquida sæpe refulget aqua.*" The pools near Heshbon, perhaps just two pools lying near together before one of the principal gates of this city, may have been especially suited for such a comparison by the clearness of their sheets of water and the loveliness of their banks. Modern travellers, as SEETZEN, BURCKHARDT, *etc.*, still mention at least one large reservoir of water near Hesbân (the ancient Heshbon, the city of the Moabitish kings, Deut. ii. 24 ff.; Isa. xv. 4), lying in a wady south of the city, which is enthroned on a high hill, and consisting of excellent masonry; comp. CROME, *Palästina*, I., 254 ff.—**At the gate of the daughter of multitudes.**—This "daughter of multitudes" (בַּת רַבִּים lit. "daughter of many," λεωφόρος) or populous city is assuredly Heshbon itself (comp. the frequent designation of cities by the personifying expression בַּת "daughter," *e. g.*, Isa. i. 8; x. 32; xxiii. 12; Ps. cxxxvii. 8), a city which in the age of David and Solomon was certainly next to Rabbath Ammon, the most populous place in the neighboring kingdoms, or rather provinces of Israel east of the Jordan. HENGSTENBERG's opinion is inadmissible that בַּת רַבִּים is only another expression for רַבָּה "Rabbah," or רַבַּת בְּנֵי עַמּוֹן "Rabbath of the children of Ammon," so that here the pools of two trans-jordanic cities would be named. And so is HITZIG's notion that "the populous" is the name of a particular gate* of the city of Heshbon (בַּת רַבִּים therefore not genitive but appositive), *viz.*, that at which the markets and the tribunals were commonly held; for there is no example anywhere else of the personification of the gates of a city as daughters.—**Thy nose like the tower of Lebanon, which looks toward Damascus.**—Literally: as "a tower of Lebanon"†—but it does not follow from this absence of the definite article that one tower out of several of the same kind and situation is intended (HITZIG). For it is plainly designated as a watch-tower, or a look-out by צוֹפֶה וגו׳; and though there may have been in all several structures of this description on Mount Lebanon (for according to 2 Sam. viii. 6 David had set military garrisons in Damascene Syria), yet there could scarcely have been more than one that "looked toward Damascus," *i. e.*, which served for the military observation of this city, which since Rezon's defection had become dangerous to Israel's northern frontier (comp. 1 Kings xi. 23, 24). Naturally enough it cannot now be accurately determined where this tower of Lebanon is to be looked for, whether at Fukra, in the neighborhood of which ROBINSON indicates a "remarkable tower" probably designed for military purposes (*Zeitschr. d. Deutsch.-Morgenl. Gesellsch.* VII. 1, 77), or at Magdol, a place in the same region, with a very ancient temple looking to the north (*ibid.*, p. 72). At all events, however, this tower of Lebanon is totally distinct from the tower of David mentioned iv. 4, and this the more certainly as the latter served to represent a majestic and beautifully ornamented neck, and the former a straight nose, forming a handsome profile.

Ver. 6. **Thy head upon thee like Carmel.**—On the somewhat inaccurate expression "thy head upon thee," in which the head appears in some sort as an appendage to the entire man, comp. 2 Kings vi. 31; Judg. xiv. 18.—The main thing to be regarded in the comparison with Carmel is, that next to Lebanon it is the loftiest mountain in Northern Palestine, and for this reason perhaps it is often designated רֹאשׁ הַכַּרְמֶל "head of Carmel" (1 Kings xviii. 42; Am. ix. 3; comp. Jer. xlvi. 18); probably also there may be a subordinate reference to its being covered with dense woods, an emblem of a luxuriant growth of hair (Mic. vii. 14; comp. v. 13 *a* above)—whilst its loveliness, which HENGSTENBERG would have to be most of all regarded, is probably left out of the account.—**And thy flowing locks like purple.**—דַּלָּה here *coma pendula*—literally "the pendant, that which hangs down from thy head" (comp. Isa. xxxviii. 12, where it denotes the thrum, *i. e.*, the threads of the old web hanging down on the loom, to which the new are attached) from דלל *pendere*, Job xxxviii. 4.—In the comparison of the hair with purple

* [So THRUPP: "That gate of Heshbon which opened north-eastward in the direction of Rabbah of Ammon," or "the gate of approach to the pools, the portal through which the multitude of the Gentile world presses to drink to the full of the clear and unruffled waters of Christian doctrine."]

† [The correct translation is "the tower of Lebanon," the entire expression being rendered definite by the article before the last noun. See GREEN's *Heb. Gram.* § 246, 3.—TR.]

Digitized by Google

(אַרְגָּמָן particularly denoting the red purple in distinction from the dark violet-blue purple or תְּכֵלֶת) the color is not so much taken into consideration—for red hair, or such as at all inclines to a reddish cast, is not at all supposable in an Oriental beauty—as its dark lustre (comp. v. 11). As also with the Greeks πορφύρεος often has almost the same signification with μέλας, and hence, *e. g.*, ANACREON (xxviii. 6, 7) uses πορφυραὶ χαῖται as the synonym of κόμαι μέλαιναι; PROPERTIUS, III., 17, 22, speaks of the *purpurea coma* of Nisus, and SUIDAS explains the Homeric κυανοχαίτης by "μελανόθριξ, πορφυρόθριξ" (other pertinent citations from TIBULL., VIRG., CIC., PLIN., *etc.*, see in ROSENM. and DÖPKE *in loc.*). It is, moreover, also possible that some purple ornament, that Shulamith may have worn braided in her hair (comp. *Iliad*, xvii. 52), gave occasion to the comparison; whilst there is no need whatever of supposing an allusion to the later custom among the Hebrew women of dying their hair with henna and the like to give it a yellowish red appearance. Comp. DÖPKE *in loc.* and WINER *R.-W.-B.*, Art. "Haar."—**A king fettered by curls.** The noble lustre of his beloved's head of hair just described makes the transition easy to the powerful effect which it, or more particularly her wonderfully beautiful locks, has wrought on him, her royal lover (comp. iv. 9). On the comparison of pretty locks with nets or snares, in which the lover is caught, Ecclus. ix. 3, 4, as well as numerous parallels from Oriental poets (in EWALD, HEILIGST., and DÖPKE); also Prov. vi. 25, where this ensnaring effect is attributed to the eye-lashes, as Eccles. vii. 26, to the arms of the beloved object. The VULG., SYR., LUTH., and more recently WEISSBACH and FRIEDRICH connect* מֶלֶךְ with אַרְגָּמָן: "as the king's purple," or as "purple of a king," but in so doing involve themselves in inextricable difficulties in the explanation of the concluding words: אָסוּר בָּרְהָטִים (*e. g.*, FRIEDRICH: "as the purple of a king that is unbound like the folds in the troughs;" WEISSBACH: "as a king's purple fastened in running water"—where an allusion is supposed to the purple dye-houses on the Phœnician side of Carmel)!

9. THIRD SCENE, *a.* SOLOMON: vers. 7–11.

Ver. 7. **How fair art thou, and how comely, O love, among delights.**—It is no more necessary here than in iii. 10, to take אַהֲבָה in the sense of אֲהוּבָה, as is done by the VULG. ("*charissima*") and SYR., or to point it accordingly as HITZIG proposes. We evidently have to do with an apostrophe to love as such, like that contained in iv. 10, only for the more concrete idea "thy love," the more universal one of love in general is here substituted. אַהֲבָה has substantially the same sense as in ii. 7, v. 8, viii. 6, 7, or as in 2 Sam. i. 26, *etc.* In a strangely arbitrary manner WEISSBACH takes אַהֲבָה in its proper infinitive sense as in apposition with the predicate not as a vocative: "how fair art thou, and how comely, a loving in delight"—which is made to mean "one, to love whom awakens delight."—תַּעֲנוּגִים (or תַּעֲנוּגוֹת Eccles. ii. 8) are not "caresses" (HENGSTENB.), but the sensations of pleasure connected with them, "joys, delights" (comp. Prov. xix. 10, Mic. i. 16, ii. 9). Solomon does not mean by it vulgar, carnal pleasure, but the sweet joys of connubial intercourse, as he now experiences them anew in embracing Shulamith.—On the necessity of assuming either an exit of the chorus, or their withdrawal to the back-ground during the enthusiastic manifestations of conjugal tenderness which begin here, comp. above, No. 2, p.100, where all that was necessary is noted respecting the propriety of having a new scene begin with this verse.

Ver. 8. **This thy stature resembles a palm tree.** The זֹאת "this" before קוֹמָתֵךְ "thy stature" is commonly regarded as referring back to the description of the beauty of the beloved, contained in vers. 2–6, which however is the more inadmissible, as separate parts only of the body were there spoken of, for whose combination into one idea מַרְאֶה (v. 15), and not קוֹמָה, would have been the proper expression. DELITZSCH correctly remarks: "As he lets her go from his arms, he surveys her figure with his eyes, and finds it like the palm-tree," *etc.* To get a lively impression of her towering stature (comp. קוֹמָה in Isa. x. 33; Ezek. xxxi. 3; Ps. xxxvii. 24), he must have let go of her for a moment at least, and have contemplated her more from a distance. The female name Tamar, which is not an unusual one in the Old Test., is based upon the comparison, which is quite a favorite with oriental poets, of a tall and slender stature with the palm (comp. FRAEHN on *Ibn Fossl.*, p. 72; also HOMER, *Od.* vii. 160). **And thy breasts clusters,** *i. e.* those of the palm-tree, by which must be intended the date-palm, loaded with its clusters of fruit (correctly ROSENMUELLER, BÖTTCHER, HITZIG), especially as it is not until the following verse that the transition is made to clusters of grapes, which are expressly designated as such by the addition of הַגֶּפֶן "the vine." That the date clusters are rather hard, and to that extent appear not to correspond to the swelling softness of the breasts, does not impair the suitableness of the comparison, as the only thing regarded is the form (vs. WEISSB.) Moreover, the mention of breasts again in this passage (comp. ver. 4) proves that the preceding description (vers. 2–6) is not closely connected with that before us, and consequently that WEISSBACH's opinion that twelve beauties are designedly enumerated in vers. 2–11 (*viz.*, the stature and the breasts, in addition to the preceding ten), lacks confirmation.

Ver. 9. **I resolve I will climb the palm-tree,** אָמַרְתִּי is not to be taken as a preterite "I said," or "I resolved," at some former time, *etc.*, as though these words referred back to v. 1 (so

*[So too HOUBIGANT and THRUPP; the latter of whom renders: "like royal purple enfixed among the wainscotings. The picture is that of a rich chamber, on the walls of which are carved wooden panels alternate with purple hangings. The former serve to relieve and to show off the beauty of the latter, to which latter the well-ordered and well-fastened tresses of the bride's hair are compared."]

Digitized by Google

VULG., LUTHER, *etc.*), but as a present, since several other wishes are uttered in what follows, but no mention is made of any previous fulfilment of these wishes. Comp. also תְּשׁוּקָתוֹ ver. 11, which plainly points to a fond desire of her lover, just manifested afresh, not to one entertained at a former period. **I will grasp its boughs.** סַנְסִנִּים lit. "that which is on top" (kindred with סלל, תלל to lift up), *i. e.*, the branches and leaves forming the crown of the palm-tree. A more particular interpretation of the figure, *e. g.*, so that the nose and mouth, which her lover wished to kiss, are here intended by the "branches" (WEISSB.), is inadmissible, and leads to offences against good taste.—**And be thy breasts, please, like clusters of the vine** (comp. on ver. 8), **and the breath of thy nose like apples.** Nothing more is here expressed than the design to kiss, or to revel in the beauty and the sweetness of the face and the bosom of his beloved. Chap. iv. 16, v. 1, is, therefore, not to be directly compared.—"The breath of the nose" (comp. Isa. ii. 22, 2 Sam. xxii. 16) is here expressly mentioned, because this is what is perceived in kissing the mouth. The figure of apples is the more appropriate, because the apple תַּפּוּחַ derives its name in Hebrew from its delightful fragrance.

Ver. 10. **And thy palate like the best wine.** The palate is not named here as the organ of speech (HENGSTENB. and others), but as a substitute for the mouth or the lips in respect to the sweet breath or lovely kisses (comp. v. 13). יֵין הַטּוֹב lit. "wine of the good" (comp. בִּרְכַּת־טוֹב Prov. xxiv. 25), is equivalent to "delightful, excellent wine." See on this periphrasis for the adjective, EWALD, *Lehrb.* § 287, *b* [GREEN's *Heb. Gram.*, § 254, 6, *b*].—**Going down for my beloved smoothly.** As the supposition that לְדוֹדִי "for my beloved" has slipped in here by mistake from the 11th verse following (AMM., HEILIGST., HITZ.: also EWALD formerly), is as arbitrary as its change to לְדוֹדַי "my love" (VELTH., MEIER), or to לְדוֹדִים "beloved ones, friends" (so EWALD now), there is no doubt that Shulamith here takes up the king's words, in order as in iv. 16 to continue his description, and to give him to understand, in the most flattering way, that she fully responds to his love, and is ready to grant him every enjoyment of it.—**Gliding over the lips of sleepers.** Others: causing the lips of those that are asleep to speak (MERCERUS, HENGSTENB., DEL., *etc.*, connecting דּוֹבֵב with דִּבָּה speaking (in a bad sense), slander); or "causing the lips of sleepers to long for it" (WEISSB.), *etc.* But for דבב—whence דֹּב as the name of the bear with his slow and awkward gait—the signification "to flow gently," or "to glide," is suitable enough, and the meaning undoubtedly is, that pleasant tasting wine easily puts one to sleep, so that he who drinks it is insensibly overtaken by slumber (correctly Ew.). There is certainly no allusion to the *saliva oris* of two lovers united in a kiss, (according to the expression in LUCRETIUS, "*junguntque salivas oris*," *etc.*) for such an image of refined sensuality is inconceivable in the mouth of the chaste Shulamith.

Ver. 11. **I am my beloved's** (comp. vi. 3), **and for me is his desire.**—Lit.: "and on me (rests) his desire." תְּשׁוּקָה as in Gen. iii. 16, the passage which lies at the basis of this, of the longing desire of the man for the society of his wife, not of gross sensual desires for sexual intercourse. The whole is a triumphant exclamation in which Shulamith joyfully affirms that her lover cannot exist without her, and it thus prepares the way for her making the request of him, which follows. With indescribable vulgarity HITZIG asserts that "the concubine here recognizes with faltering voice and bursting eyes the mutual necessity of love."

10. CONTINUATION AND CONCLUSION. *b.* Shulamith's victorious assault on Solomon's heart, vii. 12—viii. 4.

Ver. 12. **Come, my beloved, let us go out to the country.**—The beloved (דּוֹד) who is addressed, can be no other than the one addressed just before in vers. 10, 11, that is to say, Solomon, not the "shepherd," to whom she certainly would not have been obliged in the first instance to have expressed her wish to escape from the contracted city walls into the country in the form of an earnest entreaty, and a fluent and impassioned persuasion, even if he were with her in Jerusalem (vs. BÖTTCH., HITZ., REN.); and if he was not with her, it was utterly useless to address these words to him when far remote (vs. Ew., VAIH.). Her persuasion is plainly directed to a lover, who was really present, and besides was seriously meant, not a mere fantastical make-believe request, a desire which the petitioner was convinced beforehand could not possibly be granted (vs. WEISSB.).—**Let us lodge in the villages.**—To the country (שָׂדֶה) are here added villages (כְּפָרִים from כֹּפֶר 1 Sam. vi. 18; construct כְּפַר) as in 1 Chron. xxvii. 25. They are alone adapted to the idea of "lodging, passing the night" (לִין), not "cypress-flowers" or "alhennas," which DÖPKE, Ew., MEIER unsuitably mingle in here, and which could scarcely have been so common then in the holy land, that people could sleep on them or under them (comp. on i. 14).—On the necessity of spending at least two nights on the way from Jerusalem to Shunem, see on iii. 8 above (p. 82).

Ver. 13. **Let us start early for the vineyards.**—It is not vineyards lying on the route to Shunem, which they might visit on their way, that are here intended, but doubtless the vineyards at Shulamith's home, and probably her own. For it was in these alone that she could take so lively an interest as is expressed in what follows.—**We shall see whether the vine has sprouted, its blossoms opened.**—The vines and pomegranates here named are the same as those in vi. 11. Shulamith wishes to return with her lover to just those innocent rural occupations and pleasures, which are there described as belonging to her former mode of life. The season implied, as in vi. 11 and in ii. 11 ff., is the

Digitized by Google

spring—that period in the year which most incites and allures to the enjoyment of external nature. It is inadmissible to suppose that precisely one year had elapsed between the spring depicted in those passages and that which is here implied (HITZ.). It is more probable—inasmuch as the whole action appears to run its course in two or three weeks (comp. on ii. 8 ff. above, p. 69)—that the same spring is meant here as there, supposing the poet to have formed a clear conception of the intervals between the main particulars of the action.—**There will I give thee my love.**—דֹּדַי means not "thy caresses bestowed on me," but "mine bestowed on thee." This to be sure, she has already granted him (see iv. 16; vii. 7 ff.), but not as yet continuously, nor without temporary disturbances and interruptions (comp. vi. 4 f.; vi. 11), nor as yet with the full and unreserved opening of her heart. But *there* (שָׁם with strong emphasis, as Am. vii. 12) there amid the loveliness and joyous freedom of fair nature she will become entirely his.—Observe how little this passage again suits the so-called shepherd hypothesis; or even WEISSBACH's supposition that Shulamith is not serious in uttering the wish before us, and that שָׁם אֶתֵּן is therefore to be taken conditionally: "There would I give—if it were only supposable that you could go with me" (?!).

Ver. 14. **The mandrakes give forth their odor.**—הַדּוּדָאִים are not "lilies" (LUTHER), but the fruit of the mandrake (*mandragora vernalis*, or *atropa mandragora*), a wild plant common in Palestine, particularly in Galilee (SCHUBERT, *Reise*, III., 117), of the same genus with the belladonna, with small whitish-green blossoms, which in May or June become small yellow apples, about the size of a nutmeg, of a strong and agreeable odor (*μῆλα εὔοσμα*, *Test. Issachar*, c. 1; comp. *Dioscorid.* IV. 76: *εὐώδη μετὰ βάρους τινός*). As now these apples have a pleasant smell, but not the blossoms nor the plant itself, Shulamith of course refers to the former, and here therefore looks forward to a more advanced season than in ver. 13—that is to say, the time of wheat harvest (see Gen. xxx. 14), as in what follows in her mention of "this year's fruit" her imagination goes still further forward.—These apples, according to Gen. xxx. 14–16, were regarded as an artificial provocative of sexual love (whence also the name דּוּדָאִים from דּוֹדִים, דּוֹד) even in the earliest Oriental antiquity; so also by the Greeks and Romans, by whom they were therefore called *κιρκαία*, *Circeta* (comp. also the name 'Αφροδίτη μανδραγορῖτις in HESYCHIUS and PHAVORINUS), by the Arabs, who to this day call them *tuffâh es-Shaitân*, "Satan's apples," by all Christendom in the middle ages (see GRAESSE, *Beiträge zur Literatur und Sage des Mittelalters*, 1850), and by many still in modern times; comp., *e. g.*, Father MYLLER in his *Journey to the Promised Land:* "This root (!), which I found in the wilderness of St. John the Baptist, and brought considerable of it away with me, has many medicinal virtues, removes barrenness, and makes efficacious love-potions." (See DEL., *Genesis*, p. 467.) Shulamith certainly does not name the *dudaim* here on account of these supposed aphrodisiac qualities, much less does she mean to intimate an intention to prepare a magic potion from them to excite her lover to a higher degree of affection. This fruit is rather to her in her innocence and simplicity merely the symbol of love, and her naming them here like the "excellent fruits of all sorts over our doors" is merely designed to add to the attractions and enjoyments of her home, which she had before mentioned, such as were new and less familiar to her lover (see WEISSB. *in loc.*). MEIER goes too far in seeking a symbolic sense for the words, when he understands "the love apples are fragrant" to mean simply "I am deeply in love," and "the old fruit and the new" there mentioned to signify the sweet fruits of love, of which she would give him to partake, the old love which had been in existence hitherto, and the new, which would meanwhile grow up and reach a heightened intensity. See in opposition to this allegorizing, which fritters away the simple freshness of a description so true to nature for the sake of insipid trivialities, HITZ. and WEISSB. *in loc.*—**And over our doors are all sorts of excellent fruit, new as well as old.**—By "our doors" Shulamith means the doors of her parental home in Shunem, where, besides her brothers and sister (i. 6; viii. 8), her mother still lived (comp. iii. 4; viii. 2). This house had probably several doors, at all events a front and a back door, and likely also side doors, whence the plural. On shelves in the inside over these doors they may have kept choice ripe fruit, as is often done in our farmers' houses; hence the עַל "over" before פְּתָחֵינוּ "our doors," which can neither mean "in front of" (LUTHER, v. AMM.), nor "within" (MAGN.) nor "by" or "at" (COCC., HAHN, GOLTZ, *etc.*). Prov. xvii. 19 also seems to allude to a use of the beams or boards over the doors of rustic dwellings for keeping various objects (even if not exactly for the construction of regular store-rooms).—On מְגָדִים lit., "excellencies, precious things" comp. iv. 13. כָּל־ refers to the various kinds of this fine fruit, not as WEISSB. affirms, to the distinction between this year's and last year's fruit. As regards these two expressions (חֲדָשִׁים גַּם יְשָׁנִים), they are both to be taken in the same sense as Mat. xiii. 52 *καινὰ καὶ παλαιά* (comp. also Lev. xxv. 22; xxvi. 10), and as epithets limiting כָּל־מְגָדִים; they must not in violation of the accents be connected with the final clause "I have, my beloved, laid up for thee" (vs. MAGN., DEL., MEIER). This as well as the reference of the verb צָפַנְתִּי to the whole sentence from עַל־פְּתָחֵינוּ onward, as if the last three clauses of the verse formed one long period (EW., UMBR., WEISSB.) is inadmissible, for though she might speak of having stored old or last year's fruit for her lover, the same could not be said of this year's, which had still to ripen and grow.

VIII. 1. **O that thou wert as a brother of mine,** כְּאָח cannot possibly be taken as a simple vocative (SEPTUAG., LUTH.). It rather refers to a relation like that of a brother ("as a brother of mine," comp. Ps. xxxv. 14) and consequently expresses the wish and that a wish seriously

Digitized by Google

meant and speedily to be realised (vs. WEISSB.), that Solomon would come so near to her in every respect, both inwardly and outwardly, that she could regard and treat him just as her own brother, as a member of her family, belonging to her own domestic household. The wish here expressed would have no meaning in respect to a lover of the rank of a shepherd. It most manifestly implies as its object a lover, whose whole station in life was above that of his beloved, in whose case there must be a coming down from his elevation, if an actual living communion is to subsist between him and her. For the fact of his having made his beloved a "queen" and a "prince's daughter" is evidently without effect on the child-like and humble mind of this simple child of nature. She has not been able to prevail upon herself in addressing this proud lord of a harem, surrounded by his sixty queens and his eighty concubines, as well as by his female slaves, to call him her own with the same cordial confidence that a sister cherishes towards her brother. She has learned to call him דּוֹד "beloved" but not אָח "brother," often as he may since their marriage have addressed her as אֲחֹתִי כַלָּה "my sister, bride." If this relation which she sustained to him be correctly estimated, HENGSTENBERG's paraphrase of the exclamation before us "O that thou who art my brother, wouldst enter into a really brotherly relation to me" will appear to be by no means so absurd, as WEISSB. would represent it.* **Were I to find thee without, I would kiss thee.** "Without," *i. e.* on the street or in the open country and in general wherever I must now observe a stiff courtly etiquette toward thee as king. A new protest therefore against the manners of the harem, which had become intolerable to her.—**Yet none would despise me.** לֹא־יָבוּזוּ לִי they, *viz.* the people, would not despise and reproach me as though I were a vulgar wench who kissed strange men in the public street; comp. Prov. vii. 12, 18.

Ver. 2. **I would lead thee, bring thee to my mother's house.** What she had only dreamed before iii. 4, she can now utter to her lover as the burning wish of her heart, certain of its speedy accomplishment. אֶנְהָגְךָ "I would lead thee," that is to say by the hand; whither is told by the following verb, which limits the one before it in the same way as אֶשָּׁקְךָ does אֶמְצָאֲךָ in ver. 1, *b.*—**Thou wouldst instruct me.** Again an indication that the lover is not a young shepherd but the wise and learned king Solomon, in comparison with whom Shulamith had long learned to feel her ignorance and at the same time her need of instruction from the rich stores of his mind. Feeling the incongruity of instruction by a lover, who was a mere shepherd, HITZ. has taken up again the conjecture of IBN EZRA, that שֶׁ is to be supplied before תְּלַמְּדֵנִי and the verb thus converted into a relative clause is to be referred as a 3d pers. fem. to the preceding אִמִּי: "my mother who would teach me," *viz.* how to do every thing for you in the best manner. But this is quite arbitrary; for all the verbs before and after are in the 2d pers. [?]; a verb thus extraordinarily interrupting this series must necessarily have been indicated not merely by שֶׁ or אֲשֶׁר but by an emphatic הִיא "she"; and to this הִיא would then have to be opposed an אֲנִי אַשְׁקְךָ *etc.* comp. (BÖTTCHER *Neue Aehrenl.* III. 172). Most of the ancient versions confirm ours, which is the common view; and that the SEPT. and SYR. in place of תְּלַמְּדֵנִי have mechanically repeated the last line of iii. 4, can prove nothing against its correctness. **I would give thee to drink of the spiced wine.** That אַשְׁקְךָ "I would cause thee to drink" contains an intentional allusion to אֶשָּׁקְךָ "I would kiss thee," ver. 1, which is identical in its consonants, is an idle remark of HITZIG and WEISSBACH, which has little in its favor. MEIER has needlessly taken this clause to be a statement of what her lover was to teach the speaker, "thou wouldst teach me how to make thee drink," *etc.*; so too EWALD and HEILIGST., according to whom the meaning is: "from thy mouth I would learn, what is pleasant and agreeable to thee. *viz.*, to cause thee to drink," *etc.* But all is simpler and in better taste if we assume no close relation between תְּלַמְּדֵנִי "thou wouldst instruct me" and this clause, and find nothing intimated here beyond the reciprocity subsisting between the spiritual gifts which the teacher confers, and the bodily refreshment which his pupil affords him in turn (comp. Luke x. 38 ff., 1 Cor. ix. 11; Gal. vi. 6).—By the spiced wine, of which she means to give him to drink, Shulamith probably means grape wine mixed with fragrant and pungent essences (according to a well-known oriental custom, comp. DÖPKE and VAIH., *in loc.*). The definite article designates this wine as the well known drink of superior excellence, as the spiced wine *par excellence;* comp. יֵין הַטּוֹב vii. 10. **Of my pomegranate juice.** Notwithstanding the absence of the copula something different from the preceding is here intended and not the spiced wine itself, as though this were merely made from the juice of fruit (HITZIG). For such a difference is indicated by the use of עָסִיס "must, unfermented juice," instead of the preceding יַיִן "wine," as well as by the mention above of the vine along with the pomegranate (vii. 13, comp. vi. 11). The suffix in רִמֹּנִי (for which the VULG. and SYR. read רִמּוֹנַי "my pomegranates") is gen. of possession to עָסִיס (comp. הַר קָדְשִׁי) hence equivalent to "pomegranate wine prepared by me." It makes against the view of WEISSBACH and others: "of the wine of my pomegranate tree," that according to vi. 11; vii. 13, Shulamith had more than one such tree.—The ancients called the fermented juice of pomegranates "wine," as appears from PLIN. *H. N.* 14, 16: "*Vinum fit—e punicis, quod rhoiden* (*ῥοιά*,

* [WILLIAMS: She suggests a wish that her relation to him were rather that of an infant brother than a husband; that she might be at liberty to express her affection in the strongest and most public manner, without incurring the charge of forwardness or indecorum.]

Digitized by Google

pomegranate) *vocant*"; comp. WINER *R.-W.-B.* Art. "Wein."

Ver. 3. **His left hand (is) under my head and his right embraces me.** This verse is not a mere phrase to mark the termination of a section, and unconnected with what precedes (HITZIG). It rather stands in the same sort of connection with the detailed description given vii. 13 ff. of what the two lovers would do and enjoy together in Shulamith's home, that ii. 6 does with the preceding representation of their mutual enjoyment of nature and of love, i. 16 ff.; ii. 3 ff. Only there Shulamith was depicting the present, whilst here she vividly portrays joys belonging to the future; though not in an optative form, as EWALD, VAIH., *etc.*, assume without sufficient reason.

Ver. 4. **I adjure you, ye daughters of Jerusalem,** *etc.*—On the significance of this exclamation here as Shulamith's farewell to the daughters of Jerusalem (which HITZIG too has seen with substantial correctness), see on ii. 7 above. Only it is not necessary with VAIH. to impute the brevity of its form to the excited and reproachful tone in which Shulamith, who had been affronted by the ladies of the court, here speaks.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The churchly allegorical exegesis is necessarily precluded from gaining an insight into the progress of the action in the act before us. It finds every where figurative representations of soteriological mysteries with no inner organic connection; shifting figures, the aim of which lies in the repeated exhibition of the central point of Christian truth, the conversion, justification, sanctification and perfection of the sinner by the grace of the Redeemer, or the call and election of the whole church to the saving communion of God in Christ. Thus the narrative of the dream, v. 2–7, together with the following dialogue, as far as vi. 3, that is to say, the first scene according to our division seems to it to be a dramatic representation, which is already complete, of the apostasy and restoration of the Church, or of the fall and redemption of mankind. This one section constitutes, as it were, the Canticles in brief, a poetic picture of the entire history of redemption from first to last. This representation opens, according to HENGSTENB. (p. 135), with a "dark scene," or night piece. The apostasy of unbelieving mankind from their God, and especially the rejection of the Saviour by the daughter of Zion, together with the punishment of induration and blindness which overtook her in consequence, are so distinctly set forth by the dream-like figures of Shulamith's sleep, her lover's vain desire to be admitted, his subsequent disappearance, and the fruitless search for him, and finally by the blows which the watchmen (the "heavenly ministers of vengeance") administered to her during her search, that the whole forms, so to speak, a fit accompaniment to Isa. liii. and likewise an illustration of Rom. xi. 7, "the election hath obtained it and the rest were blinded," or of Rom. xi. 25, 26. And then again the representation is directed to the goal of the ultimate conversion of Israel and the consequent consummation of the entire redemptive process. For forsaken and repelled by her lover, she nevertheless continues always sick with love and longing for him (v. 8); in answer to the question proposed to test her, what she thinks of her lover (v. 9), she exhibits a heart full of love and submission to the heavenly Solomon, as the ideal of all excellence (v. 10–16); finally she answers the second question also, which is addressed to her to pave the way for her reunion with her heavenly bridegroom, in a concrete manner (vi. 1–3), since in her answer to, Where has thy beloved gone? she ungrudgingly recognizes that he has his being in the Church, and in consequence of this recognition the former relation may be regarded as restored.—So HENGSTENBERG, whose view may be regarded as the idealizing recapitulation of all former churchly-allegorical interpretations of this section.—The following portions also depict according to him the one main object of the song again and again—the restoration of the loving relation between the Lord and His Church, which originally existed, was then disturbed and broken off, and has finally been cemented again. Ch. vi. 4–10 does this in the form of praises of the beauty of the bride, and a comparison of her with all other women, who constitute the household of the heavenly Solomon. Ch. vi. 11—vii. 1 in the form of a narrative by the daughter of Zion of the way in which she attained to the high dignity of a bride of heaven's king, together with a blessing bestowed upon her by the daughters of Jerusalem, who express their heartfelt joy at her return from her wanderings, and at the distinguished graces which have in consequence been imparted to her; ch. vii. 2–11, in the form of a new panegyric pronounced by the king upon the daughter of Zion, who has returned to him from her straying, and consequently to her former beauty,—to which is further added the expression of his determination to enjoy her charms, and her cordial assent to this determination (vii. 8–11); and finally, vii. 12 to viii. 4, in the form of a prayer from the daughter of Zion to her heavenly lover, to restore to her his ancient love, and, far from the tumult of this sinful world, in rural retirement and seclusion, to live with her as her brother.—The explanations of the older allegorists are still richer in repetitions and in corresponding measure poorer in true inward progress. One of their number, *e. g.*, STARKE (who closely follows MARCK, AINSWORTH, MICHAEL., *etc.*) paraphrases vi. 2, 3, so as to make the bride set forth "the delightful feelings resulting from the special presence of the bridegroom of her soul, which she has just experienced in her heart," describing thus Christ's control in the spice garden of His Church, *i. e.*, in the hearts of the true children of God, wherein the whole work of salvation by the Lord in the word and sacraments, and His operations on individual souls, planting, fostering, preserving and perfecting, is briefly exhibited. Ch. vii. 1 he then paraphrases thus: "Return, return to me and to thyself from the confusion, in which thou wert, before I revealed myself again to thee (v. 6; Ps. cxvi. 7), O Shulamith, who hast obtained peace with God, righteousness and strength in communion with me; return again, banish all gloomy and timorous thoughts. I shall ever remain thy Jesus, thy Saviour and Benefactor. Fix only a confiding

Digitized by Google

heart again on me, thy soul's friend, that we, *viz.* I, thy Redeemer, with my Father who loves thee in me, and the Holy Spirit may look upon thee, *i. e.*, may have our delight and joy in thee as a perfect mirror of spiritual beauty." And in viii. 1 the same interpreter remarks upon the words, "Should I find thee without, I would kiss thee," *etc.*: If I find thee without, *i. e.*, meet thee outside of my mother's house, while I live in the foreign land and the pilgrimage of this world (2 Cor. v. 6–9), I will kiss thee with the kiss of faith, love and obedience, yea, give thee all conceivable tokens of my sincere and ardent love (Ps. ii. 12; Hos. xiii. 2; Job xxxi. 27). And no one should put me to shame, least of all they, to whom I appear so despicable, and who scoff at me when I boast of my communion with thee and declare thy praise (v. 7; Gen. xxxviii. 28, *etc.*, *etc.*)." In short, every possible thing is here found in every thing, and the simple meaning of the words is almost every where sacrificed to the superabundant fancy of a dogmatical and mystical interpretation.

2. The proper antithesis to such excesses can surely not lie in banishing with the profane-erotic exegesis every thing sacred from the course of the action here presented, and converting it, as is done particularly by Hitzig and Renan, into a succession of voluptuous scenes in the harem, without order or progress. This view becomes really repulsive, especially where it maintains that the poet brings Solomon's love for other favorites than Shulamith before his readers or spectators by a detailed description of his amorous intercourse with them; that he describes with particularity by word and act how the king turns wearied away from the coy Shulamith, to "indemnify" himself with the other beauties of his harem. Hitzig's exegesis on the passage vii. 2–11 based on this understanding of it, even Böttcher indignantly pronounces one that "culminates in the disgustingly vulgar,"—a judgment that might with equal reason be passed upon Renan's treatment of the same section. But even in its more moderate form, as advanced by Herder, Umbr., Ew., Vaih., *etc.*, the shepherd hypothesis invariably involves much that is of doubtful morality, by which the religious and ethical character of the section before us is sensibly damaged in several points. Solomon's character especially suffers more than is just, inasmuch as there is heaped upon him besides the reproach of polygamy with its excesses, that of an assiduous attempt at seduction and a corrupting assault upon female innocence, an actually adulterous procedure therefore,—which especially in the so-called "final assault," vii. 2–10, comes into unseemly contrast with the alleged fidelity of the maiden to a distant lover. Shulamith's character, too, appears on this view less fair and great than in ours; the extravagance, not to say the braggart character of the description given of her lover, v. 10–16, if this refers to a plain young shepherd, is particularly offensive; so is the excited pathos of the appeal which, according to this view, is directed to a far distant lover to go with her into the country, vii. 12 ff. Some of the finest and loveliest traits in the picture of this noble woman are wholly lost, especially the symbolic significance of her dream, v. 2–7; the lovely gentleness with which she seeks by her evasive answer in vi. 2, 3, to excuse her absent husband; the adroitness with which she interrupts him (vii. 10) in order wholly to disarm and captivate him; the genuine womanly naiveté with which, in her picture of the innocent joys of their life together in the country, she inserts, viii. 2, a hint of the instruction which she hopes to receive from her lover, *etc.*

3. The typical Messianic view avoids these faults in a manner which really satisfies both the æsthetic and the religious feeling. It throughout gives due prominence alike to light and shade, and while it sets forth in all its rigor the conflict of the lovely, chaste and pure child of nature with the corrupt manners of the court and her royal lover who shared them, it nevertheless paves the way likewise for a truly blessed reconciliation and removal of this conflict by showing how Shulamith's urgency to return to her country home, lays the foundation for a change of mind in her husband, and for satisfying her boldest and highest wishes. The true power of love in the humble maiden thus shines in its most glorious light, and the lover who at first resisted is drawn along by it; his resistance to the sanctity of the marriage connection is overcome by the purity of her feelings.—When put in a parallel with the relation of Christ to His Church, this episode from the story of the love of Solomon and Shulamith certainly exhibits more disparity than resemblance. But it forms also just that section of the story, in which the dissimilarity of the two relations must naturally come most strongly out, in some parts of it almost to the obliteration of every trace of similitude. And yet there remain even here significant analogies enough to establish the essentially Messianic character of the whole. Above all the glowing description of the beauty of the lover, v. 10–16, which is only applicable to Solomon, not to any of his subjects, points to the King of all kings as the heavenly prototype of that king, as the possessor of an eternal glory which far outshines the splendor of the earthly Solomon. Mankind seeking after God, and craving His salvation, the antitype in the history of redemption of the earthly Shulamith, by its earnest and continued longing, waiting, entreating and imploring, succeeds in moving this heavenly Solomon to give up his glory and enter into its low estate, as she moves her lord and king to the resolve to live with her in her mother's house, and to partake with her of all the simple country enjoyments and pleasures which this house, with its surroundings, could offer him and her. In this parallel there certainly lies a prophecy of the fulfilling of that which is written, John xiv. 23, "If a man love me, he will keep my words; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him;" likewise of 2 Cor. vi. 16 (Lev. xxvi. 11; Hebr. viii. 10), "I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people;" as well as of Rev. xxi. 3, "Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and He will dwell with them, and they shall be His people, and He himself, God with them, shall be their God." That significant phrase too, "thou wouldst instruct me," viii. 2, points to the higher stage of divine revelation to which man-

Digitized by Google

kind has been exalted under the New Testament, in the same manner as Isa. liv. 13 (John vi. 45): "And all thy children shall be taught of the LORD;" or as Jer. xxxi. 33 (Heb. viii. 10 ff.): "I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts;—and they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, saying, Know the LORD; for they shall all know me from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the LORD," (comp. Joel iii. 1 f.; Acts ii. 16 f.; 1 John ii. 27, *etc.*).—But certainly,—and herein lies the exaltation of the New Testament Solomon above the Old, and the superiority of the New Testament covenant of grace, as compared with the marriage covenant between Solomon and Shulamith—no express entreaty with flattering words and persistent supplication was needed to bring down the Lord of the New Covenant to His own. Even if here and there in His parables He assumes the air of the reluctant friend or the unmerciful judge, and thus seems to impose upon His own people the duty of importunate begging and crying (Luke xi. 5–8; xviii. 1–7), this is purposely done that the contrast between human hard-heartedness and His own infinitely merciful and prevenient love, may induce to a heartier confidence in the latter. His becoming poor in order to make us rich, His emptying and humbling Himself to the form of a servant was prevenient throughout, with no merit or worthiness on the part of man; yea, so that He "was found of them that sought Him not, and was made manifest unto them that asked not after Him" (Rom. x. 20; Isa. lxv. 1). Of His coming to His own it may in truth be said:

"You do not need to labor,
Nor struggle day and night,
To bring Him down from heaven,
By efforts of your might.
He comes of His own motion,
Is full of love and grace,
Your every grief and sorrow
He'll utterly efface."

And besides it is a real and substantial glory, which He gives up and forsakes from love to the poor children of men, not a mere seeming glory, full of sin and vanity, like that of the earthly Solomon. His love to the poor damsel of earth is so utterly unselfish that He gives everything and receives nothing, whilst she can give nothing but only receive (comp. ST. FRANCIS of Assisi's fable of the rich king Christ, and the fair damsel "Poverty"). Nay, she does not even possess as her own those "excellent fruits, new and old," with which she was to regale her gracious and heavenly guest upon his entrance into her mother's house. But it is her lover, and He alone, who makes the seed of His divine word bring forth in her good and worthy fruit, which endureth unto everlasting life. It is He alone who makes her rich in all the fruits of the Spirit and of righteousness (Phil. i. 11; Gal. v. 22, *etc.*). He alone distributes the precious wine of joy at the table of His grace, by which He solemnly seals and confirms with His earthly bride, the covenant of His love, established by His bloody sacrificial death (comp. John ii. 1–11). And while Shulamith's entreaty of her royal lord and husband "O that thou wert like my brother, who sucked the breasts of my mother" (viii. 1) can only be made in the most restricted sense,—while she, upon a calm and sober view of the case at least, can expect no more than a transient coming down of her lover into her poverty and retirement, the heavenly bridegroom of the Church, on the contrary, comes not only once and in the fullest truth, but for ever as our brother on the earth. He "is not ashamed to call all them, whom He redeems, His brethren" (Heb. ii. 11; comp. John xx. 17). He is made partaker of their earthly flesh and blood in order to raise them from being slaves of sin and death to be children of God and heirs of His eternal, heavenly blessedness (Heb. ii. 14, 15; John viii. 32–36).—Thus set in the light of His deeds of redeeming love, this section of the Canticles becomes a song of praise to the grace of the Lord, which worketh all in all, a hymn of glory to that inscrutable mystery of the Divine mercy, of which Paul exclaims, Rom. xi. 34 f.: "For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been His counsellor? Or who hath first given to Him and it shall be recompensed unto him again? For of Him, and through Him, and to Him, are all things; to whom be glory for ever. Amen."

Digitized by Google

FIFTH SONG.

The return home and the triumph of the chaste love of the wife over the unchaste feelings of her royal husband.

CHAP. VIII. 5—14.

FIRST SCENE:

THE ARRIVAL HOME.

(Vers. 5–7.)

COUNTRY PEOPLE (in the fields at Shunem).

5 Who[1] is this coming up out of the wilderness,
leaning upon her beloved?

SOLOMON (entering arm in arm with Shulamith).

Under[2] this[3] apple tree I waked thee;[4]
there[5] thy[6] mother travailed[7] with thee,
there travailed she that bare thee.

SHULAMITH (familiarly pressing up close to her lover).

6 Place[8] me as a signet-ring upon thy heart,
as a signet-ring upon thine arm.
For strong as death is love,
hard as Sheol[9] is jealousy
Its flames[10] are flames of fire,
a blaze of Jehovah.[11]

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

1 [WICL.: The voice of the synagogue, of the church. MAT.: The synagogue speaking of the church.]

2 [WICL.: The voice of Christ to the synagogue, of the holy cross. Under an apple tree I reared thee. MAT.: The voice of the spouse before the spousess. COV., MAT.: I am the same that waked thee up among the apple trees. BISH.: I waked thee up among, *etc.* GENEV.: I raised thee up under an [ENG. VER.: the] apple tree.]

3 הַתַּפּוּחַ deictic: "this apple tree."

4 We read עוֹרַרְתִּיךְ.

5 שָׁמָּה we take to be synonymous with שָׁם as in Jer. xviii. 2: 2 Kings xxiii. 8, *etc.*

6 Here too we read the fem. suf. חִבְּלַתֶךְ אִמֵּךְ and at the end of the verse יְלָדָתֶךְ (or with the SEPT., VULG., SYR. יְלִדְתֵּךְ).

7 חבל here as well as in Ps. vii. 15 is taken by IBN EZRA and HITZIG in the sense of "conceiving" [so GENEV.: conceived]; but the meaning of writhing with pain, travailing (ὠδίνειν) is more obvious and better confirmed by חֵבֶל, חֲבָלִים. At all events, we must reject MEIER's explanation: "there thy mother betrothed thee" (in like manner SCHULTENS, J. D. MICHAELIS, MAGNUS) [so too PERCY, GOOD, WILLIAMS, BURROWES and others]; for even if the sense of pledging or betrothing were certainly established for the Piel of חבל, it would still require לִי *to me*, for its more exact limitation. The VULG. (*corrupta est, violata est*) with still less propriety has taken חבל in the sense of "corrupting" (in like manner AQUILA: διεφθάρη). On the contrary, the SEPT. correctly: ἐκεῖ ὠδίνησέν σε ἡ μήτηρ σου. [WICL.: there shamed is thy mother, there defiled is she that gat thee. DOW.: "there thy mother was corrupted, there she was deflowered that bare thee;" to which is appended the note: "under the apple tree I raised thee up; that is, that Christ redeemed the Gentiles at the foot of the cross, where the synagogue of the Jews (the mother church) was corrupted by their denying Him and crucifying Him."]

8 [MAT.: The church speaking to Christ.]

9 [WICL., COV., MAT., CRAN., BISH., DOW.: hell. GENEV., ENG. VER.: the grave.]

10 [WICL., DOW.: lamps. Other English versions: coals.]

11 In שַׁלְהֶבֶתְיָה the Masorah has connected the genitive יָהּ with the construct, as in מַאְפֵּלְיָה Jer. ii. 31, and as in proper names compounded with יָהּ or יְהוֹ (the abbreviation of יהוה). The recension of BEN ASHER retains this mode of writing the expression as a compound, while that of BEN NAPHTALI separates the words. The φλόγες αὐτῆς of the SEPTUAGINT is based upon this contraction into one word. EWALD and HITZIG needlessly conjecture that the original reading was שַׁלְהֲבֹתֶיהָ שַׁלְהֲבוֹת יָהּ "its flames are flames of God." The analogy of the preceding sentences rather requires, as WEISSBACH correctly observes, the giving of two predicates to the single subject רְשָׁפֶיהָ. It is, therefore, properly to be translated "its flames are flames of fire, they are a blaze of God." On the etymology of שַׁלְהֶבֶת as a compound of אֵשׁ and לֶהָבָה compare WEISSBACH *in loc.* [The שׁ is servile, such as marks the Shaphel species in CHALD. and SYR. See GESEN. and FUERST's Lexicons. COV., MAT.: a very flame of the Lord. GENEV.: a vehement flame. ENG. VER.: a most vehement flame.]

Digitized by Google

7 Many waters cannot
quench love,
and rivers shall not wash[1] it away.
If a man were to give
all the wealth of his house for love,
he would be utterly contemned.

SECOND SCENE:

SHULAMITH WITH HER LOVER (in the circle of her friends.)

(Vers. 8–14.)

SHULAMITH.

8 A[2] sister we have, little
and she has no breasts;
what shall we do for[3] our sister
in the day that she shall be spoken for?[4]

SHULAMITH'S BROTHERS.

9 If[5] she be a wall,
we will build upon her a silver castle;
but if she be a door,
we will stop her up with a cedar board.

SHULAMITH.

10 I[6] was a wall
and my breasts like towers.
Then was I in his eyes
as one that finds peace.—
11 Solomon[7] has[8] a vineyard in Baal-hamon.
He committed the vineyard to the keepers,
each was to bring for its fruit
a thousand of silver.
12 My[9] vineyard, my own,[10] is before me;
the thousand is thine, Solomon,
and two hundred for the keepers of its fruit.

SOLOMON.

13 Thou that dwellest in the gardens,
companions are listening for thy voice;
let me hear it.

[1] שָׁטַף is neither "to deluge" (EWALD), nor "overflow" (DELITZSCH, HENGSTENBERG), nor "choke up" with sediment (ROSENM.), but "wash away, sweep away," as is shown by Job xiv. 19; comp. Isa. xxviii. 17 f.; Ezek. xvi. 9.

[2] [WICL.: The voice of Christ to the lineage of holy church. MAT.: Christ speaking of the church to the synagogue. NOTE IN GENEVA BIBLE: The Jewish church speaketh this of the church of the Gentiles. COV., MAT.: When our love is told our young sister, whose breasts are not yet grown, what shall we do unto her?]

[3] On מַה־נַּעֲשֶׂה לְ "what shall we do in respect to," *etc.*, comp. 1 Sam. x. 2; also Gen. xxvii. 37.

[4] דִּבֵּר בְּ is neither "to speak to any one," nor "to speak about any one," whether in a good or a bad sense (DOEDERL., WEISSB.), but simply and only "to speak for any one" (בְּ prep. of the end or aim, as in 7 *b*), *i. e.*, to sue for any one, to woo a maid (1 Sam. xxv. 39).

[5] [MAT.: The answer of Christ for the church.]

[6] [WICL.: The voice of the church answering. MAT.: The church answereth to the synagogue. COV., MAT.: If I be a wall and my breasts like towers, then am I as one that hath found favor in his sight.]

[7] [WICL.: The synagogue of the church saith. Vine she was to peaceable in her that hath peoples; she took it to the keepers; a man taketh away for the fruit of it, a thousand silver plates. DOW.: The peaceable had a vineyard in that which hath people. MAT.: The synagogue speaking to the church.]

[8] כֶּרֶם הָיָה לִשְׁלֹמֹה literally "a vineyard became Solomon's," *i. e.*, he has it now (comp. Ps. cxix. 56, 83; also Ezek. xvi. 8), not, he had it once, as though Solomon were here spoken of as a ruler long since dead (EWALD, HITZIG, *etc.*).

[9] [WICL.: Christ to the church saith. MAT.: The voice of Christ. COV., MAT.: But my vineyard, O Solomon, giveth thee a thousand, and two hundred to the keepers of the fruit. Thou that dwellest in the gardens, O let me hear thy voice, that my companions may hearken to the same.]

[10] On the different explanations of כַּרְמִי שֶׁלִּי see on i. 6, p. 56.

Digitized by Google

SHULAMITH (singing).

14 Flee,[1] my beloved,
and be like a gazelle,
or a young hart
upon mountains of spices.[2]

1 [WICL., MAT.: The voice of the church to Christ. WICL.: Flee thou, my love; be thou likened to a capret and to an hart, calf of harts, upon the mountains of sweet spices. COV., MAT.: O get thee away, my love, as a roe or a young hart unto the sweet smelling mountains. The end of the Ballet of Ballets of Solomon, called in Latin *Canticum Canticorum.*]

2 On the general usage of בְּשָׂמִים comp. iv. 14; v. 13; vi. 2.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. Some of the more recent interpreters dismember this last act, by attaching part of it to the preceding section, and regarding the remainder as an appendix or epilogue to the whole. Thus UMBREIT extends the last act of the piece to viii. 7, which is then followed by viii. 8–12 as a first appendix, "The shrewd old brothers and the naively jesting sister;" and viii. 13, 14 as a second appendix, "The unlucky trip to the country." In like manner RENAN, who regards the fifth act as ending with viii. 7, and the remaining seven verses as forming an epilogue. On the contrary v. HOFMANN connects vers. 5–12 with his last main division of the whole (vi. 1—viii. 12), and considers the last two verses only, vers. 13, 14, as an appendix.—DÖPKE and MAGNUS push the process of dismemberment to the greatest length, the former of whom divides this section into three separate songs (5–7; 8–12; 13, 14). The latter makes it consist of four small pieces, a lyric poem: "The parting" (5-7), two dramatic epigrams (8-10 and 11, 12), and a fragment with several glosses (13, 14).—A correct apprehension of the unity of this section as one whole, separated from the preceding by the solemn introductory formula מי זאת וגו "Who is this," *etc.*, is found in EWALD, HITZ., DEL., HENGSTENB., VAIH., BÖTTCHER, WEISSB. Only some of these, especially the last named, go too far in their assertion of the compactness and continuity of the passage, since they fail to recognize the difference between the two scenes, which it unmistakably contains. For in vers. 5-7 there is evidently represented a return home, and in vers. 8 ff. a transaction after arriving home. The former of these paragraphs exhibit the principal couple of the piece as still travelling, although quite near the end of their journey. The latter depicts their acts and doings at home in the circle of Shulamith's family, where merry jests and peaceful enjoyment reign. The two scenes of such different character are therefore related exactly as in the third act; only there the excited tumult of the capital and the noisy bustle of the royal palace on Zion resounding with luxurious festivities, formed the background of the action, whilst here an innocent rural seclusion and simplicity, a cheerful, quiet life under apple trees, in gardens, and on mountains fragrant with spices, is depicted as a bright and peaceful termination of the whole matter.

2. With respect to the time and place of the action, no well grounded doubt can exist, on the supposition that the contents and meaning of the preceding act have been correctly understood. Solomon must have yielded to the urgent entreaties of his beloved, and immediately arranged a journey to her home and started with her, so that at the utmost there can only be an interval of three or four days between this and the foregoing act. Various indications suggest Shunem, the home of Shulamith, as the goal toward which the loving pair are journeying, and consequently as the locality of this act; especially the introductory passage, ver. 5, rightly understood and interpreted, and also the mention of Shulamith's little sister, ver. 8 f., her "abiding in the gardens," ver. 13, as well as the "mountains of spices" or "mountains of balm," ver. 14, which remind us of ii. 17.—Partly on account of the introductory words, which are identical with iii. 6, "Who is this coming up out of the wilderness?" partly on account of the masc. suffixes in חבלתך אמך, עוררתיך, *etc.* (according to the Masoretic punctuation), which appear to show that the passage refers not to Shulamith's but to Solomon's birth-place, WEISSBACH (as also DÖPKE, *etc.*, before him) explains and assumes the royal palace on Zion to be the place of this action; vers. 5 ff. describe the arrival of the lovers there from the royal gardens (or more exactly from the "path or pasture ground of the royal flocks, which is to be sought between Zion and the king's gardens"); the rest of the action is then performed on Zion itself. But the correctness of the Masoretic reading in that passage is more than doubtful (see just below, No. 3); and it is only by the greatest forcing that all that follows, especially vers. 8 f., 11 ff. and ver. 13, can be brought into harmony with this transfer of the scene to Jerusalem, as is sufficiently shown by the strange combinations of WEISSBACH with respect to the circumstances, under which Bathsheba had borne Solomon "under an apple tree" and the way that Shulamith had "waked" the king on this his native spot, comp. on ver. 5 *b*.—The majority of recent interpreters are agreed with us in assuming Shunem to be the place of the action, only the advocates of the shepherd hypothesis, as might be expected, make not Solomon, but the shepherd and Shulamith arrive there and transact what follows;—a view, which is already sufficiently refuted by ver. 12 where Solomon is evidently addressed as present (see *in loc.* as well as on ver. 13), and which has as little foundation as VAIHINGER's assertion that vers. 5–7 is performed at the house of Shulamith's mother, and vers. 8 ff. "on the eastern slope of little Mt. Hermon," where her

Digitized by Google

brothers may have had their pasture ground.—When Delitzsch, whose view of the position and import of this act is in every other respect correct and appropriate, finds represented merely "a visit of Shulamith with her husband to her home," we must remark on the contrary that the entreaties and desires of Shulamith at the close of the preceding act certainly looked to more than a mere transient stay at her home, and that this was demanded by the whole state of the case.* It was only in an actual settlement both of herself and of her husband in her home that she could find the needed guarantee of an undisturbed continuance of her relation to him of cordial and conjugal love.

3. First Scene. The arrival, vers. 5–7.

Ver. 5. **Who is this coming up out of the wilderness?** So asked iii. 6 the "daughters of Jerusalem," the chorus of ladies of the court, who took part in the action until towards the end of the preceding act. This chorus could only have come to Shulamith's home in company with the royal pair; and then the question before us would be insupposable in their mouth† (vs. Renan, *etc.*). Ewald, Böttcher, Hitzig, Delitzsch, *etc.* therefore correctly assume the speakers to be "shepherds," or country people, or "inhabitants of the district," whilst Umbreit and Meier arbitrarily suppose the question to be put by the poet himself; Weissb. by courtiers on Zion, Rosenm. by citizens of Jerusalem.—מִדְבָּר lit. "place to which cattle are driven, pasture ground" (in opposition to cultivated land, comp. Isa. xxxii. 15; Joel i. 19; Ps. lxv. 13) is here used in a different sense from iii. 6 where it referred to the barren tracts north and east of Jerusalem. It is here a designation of the plain of Esdraëlon or Merj ibn 'Amir, lying southward from Shunem to Jezreel, which is still for the most part untilled and traversed by Bedouins (Robinson, *Pal.* II. 824, 862). For through this plain the travellers coming from the capital must ultimately pass.—**Leaning upon her beloved.** The long journey, though she may have got over part of it in her sedan, has wearied the delicate lady who therefore supports herself upon the arm of her husband. Failing to recognize this situation so clear in itself and so easily conceivable, the old translators have variously altered the sense of the passage. In this way we may explain the glosses to be found in the text of the Sept. and Vulg., λελευκανθισμένη (=מִתְחַבֶּרֶת) and *deliciis affluens* (=מִתְפַּנֶּקֶת), which are in both cases followed again by the correct translation of מִתְרַפֶּקֶת עַל־דּוֹדָהּ.—**Under this apple tree I waked thee.** The pointing עוֹרַרְתִּיךָ, like that of the following verb implies that Solomon is the person addressed and that Shulamith is the speaker, but the consonants admit also of the reverse, and the old Syriac version seems actually to have read fem. suffixes. Most of the older as well as of the more recent interpreters, following the Masoretic text conceive Shulamith to be the speaker, whilst Hitzig, Böttcher (who to be sure assigns a part of the verse to Shulamith's mother), Delitzsch, Rebenst., Sanders, *etc.* make her lover speak. In favor of the latter assumption it may be urged 1) that if Solomon were the person addressed, the absurd sense would result of his birth under an apple tree—a sense which is certainly not made any more tolerable by Weissbach's supposition of a "temporary sojourn of Bathsheba in the royal gardens with a view to her confinement;" 2) that in case the young shepherd were addressed the entire absence of any mention of his mother in what precedes, would be somewhat surprising and is not relieved by the parallels adduced by Ewald Gen. xxxv. 48, Donati, *vit. virg. c.* 1, *etc.*; 3) that vers. 6, 7 confessedly spoken by Shulamith would require to be more closely connected with ver. 5 *b* than they actually are, in case ver. 5 *b* was also spoken by her: 4) that the expression "travail" or "conceive" (חִבֵּל) seems fitter in the mouth of a man than of a woman, in like manner as עוררתיך when correctly explained only appears appropriate in the mouth of the lover. For this expression, which we therefore read עוֹרַרְתִּיךְ, as is shown by its likeness to תְּעֹרְרוּ ver. 4, is not to be understood of a literal awakening out of sleep (Ewald, Heiligst., Hitzig, Vaih. *etc.*) but of waking a previously slumbering affection, the stirring up of love. "I waked thee" is here equivalent to "I excited thy love, I won thy heart" (Döpke, Del., Hengstenb. *etc.*). The circumstance, to which Solomon here alludes, is manifestly identical with that described by Shulamith ii. 8 ff. We must, therefore, imagine the apple tree to be immediately adjoining the house of Shulamith's mother, and probably shading one of its windows; the following statement is thus too more easily explained.—**There thy mother travailed with thee, there travailed she that bare thee.** "There," *i. e.* not precisely under the apple tree as though the birth had taken place in the open air (Döpke), but more indefinitely, there, where that apple tree stands, in the dwelling shaded by it.

Ver. 6. **Place me as a signet-ring upon thy heart.** This is manifestly said by Shulamith in ardently loving response to what her lover had said to her, by which she had been reminded of the commencement of her relation to him. She thereupon presses familiarly and closely to him, illustrating the meaning of her words by a corresponding action. חוֹתָם the seal or signet-ring (Gen. xxxviii. 18) is here as in Jer. xxii. 24, and Hag. ii. 23 (which latter passage is probably an imitation of that before us) a symbol of close inseparable connection and most faithful preservation. Reference is had to the custom attested by Gen. *loc. cit.* of wearing signet-rings on a string upon the breast as well as

* [The transparent absurdity of this hypothesis of Solomon going to Shunem not merely for a visit but to reside, involving the abandonment of his capital and the neglect of the affairs of government, renders any scheme of the book untenable of which it is a necessary part.—Tr.]

† [Zöckler has repeatedly argued before that the recurrence of the same language implies the same speaker and the same subject: see his comment on iv. 1; iv. 6; vi. 9; vi. 10 and several times elsewhere. Whatever force there is in this consideration makes against the locality and the speakers that he here assumes. The wilderness here spoken of should not without some obvious necessity be regarded as different from that in iii. 6. And that the queen appears on foot leaning on her royal husband's arm is surely not suggestive of the termination of a long and wearisome journey.—Tr.]

Digitized by Google

to the like custom of binding them to the arm or right hand (see Jer. *loc. cit.*, Ecclus. xlix. 11); not to the use of the signet-ring for sealing, as though the sense were "press me closely to thy breast and in thy arms" (HITZIG), and quite as little to the impression taken from the seal (HERDER, DÖPKE), or to an elegantly engraved bracelet (WEISSB.), or even to the high priest's breastplate (GOLZ, HAHN, *etc.*) **For strong as death is love, hard as Sheol is jealousy.** The request that he would keep her firmly and faithfully as his inalienable possession is here based by Shulamith on a reference to the death-vanquishing power and might of her love, or rather of love (אַהֲבָה absolutely), of true love in general. "The adjectives עַזָּה and קָשָׁה stand together also in Gen. xlix. 7 to designate the passionate anger and fiery zeal of Simeon and Levi as one which was too strong and invincible to be repressed. As our poet probably (?) had this passage in mind, he doubtless designed עַזָּה to be understood here too of the all-conquering power and קָשָׁה (literally hard, resisting all impressions) of the constancy of love which baffles every attempt to suppress or to extirpate it. The comparisons also tend to the same conclusion; for death overcomes all things and the nether world (hell, sheol) cannot be subdued, comp. Job vii. 9; Wisd. ii. 1; Matt. xvi. 18; 1 Cor. xv. 55." Thus WEISSBACH, who is substantially correct, only he goes too far perhaps, in regarding Gen. xlix. 7 as the model, which the poet designedly follows in this passage. On קִנְאָה zeal, zealous love, comp. Prov. vi. 34; xxvii. 4, where however the expression is used in a bad sense of love that has cooled, jealousy. In this passage it intensifies the idea of love, just as "death" and "hell" stand to each other in the relation of climax, and as "strong" (*i. e.* invincible) indicates a lower degree of the passion of love than "hard, unyielding" (*i. e.* inexorable, not to be appeased, like the realm of death, which never gives up anything that it possesses). Comp. HITZIG *in loc.*—**Its flames are flames of fire, a blaze of Jehovah.** On רְשָׁפִים "sparks, rays, flames," comp. Job v. 7 (בְּנֵי רֶשֶׁף "sons of the flame," *i. e.* sparks of fire); Ps. lxxvi. 4 ("flashes" or "sparks of the bow," *i. e.* arrows); Deut. xxxii. 24; Hab. iii. 5, *etc.* Love or rather its intenser synonym קִנְאָה (comp. Zeph. i. 18), appears here as a brightly blazing fire, which sends forth a multitude of sparks or flames into the hearts of men and thus verifies its invincible power and its inextinguishable intensity. And this quality belongs to it because it is not natural fire, but a "blaze of Jehovah," a flame kindled and sustained by God Himself. Observe that the name of God is mentioned only in this one passage of the Song, which must, however, prove to be just the radiant apex in the development of its doctrinal and ethical contents (comp. Doct. and Eth. No. 2). As parallels to this verse may be adduced: *Motanebbi* (edit. v. HAMMER) p. 8:

In the heart of the lover flames the blaze of desire
Fiercer than the flames of hell, which are but ice in comparison.

Also ANACREON: "*νικᾳ δὲ καὶ σιδηρὸν καὶ πῦρ.*" Likewise THEOCRITUS, *Id.* 2, 133.

—— —— ἔρως δ' ἄρα καὶ Λιπαρίου
Πολλάκις Ἁφαίστοιο σέλας φλογερώτερον αἴθει.

And many other expressions of Arabic, Greek and Roman poets. See MAGNUS *in loc.*

Ver. 7. **Many waters cannot quench love, and rivers shall not wash it away.** It is here shown more particularly in what respect love is a divine flame, a fire greater than any kindled by a human hand, comp. 1 Kin. xviii. 38. To the figure of a blazing fire was readily added that of the inability of floods of water to extinguish this fire, and therefore in explanation of this new figure we need neither refer (as HITZIG does) to Isa. xliii. 16, a passage which is different in every respect, nor (with VAIHINGER and others) explain the floods of water of the enticements of Solomon in particular, by which he would have turned Shulamith away from her lover. The "rivers" (נְהָרוֹת) do not form a climax to the "many waters," as HÖLEMANN supposes (see *e. g.* on the contrary Jon. ii. 3); but in the latter case the thing chiefly regarded is the great mass of the element hostile to fire and in the former its rapidity and violence.—**If a man were to give all the wealth of his house for love,** *i. e.* with the view of exciting love and producing it artificially where it does not exist. Here we might really see something to favor the shepherd hypothesis, if a statement of the impossibility of purchasing true love was not appropriate in the mouth of Shulamith on our assumption likewise. But that this is the case, may be learned from the contrast between Shulamith's genuine, invincibly strong love for Solomon and the mere semblance of love which had previously subsisted between this king and his other wives; comp. the sentence referring to this very contrast, ii. 7; iii. 5; viii. 4, by which Shulamith represents to the ladies of the court how impossible it was for them by means of their amorous arts really to gain the king's heart (see on ii. 7, p. 63). On the expression comp. Num. xxii. 18; Prov. vi. 31, which latter passage was probably drawn from this. On אִישׁ "a man, any one," comp. Ex. xvi. 29. That it is here an indefinite subject seems the more certain from the fact that in the apodosis also a universal statement follows with an impersonal form of the verb (יָבוּזוּ לוֹ). VAIHINGER, HÖLEM., *etc.*, therefore translate without good reason "If some man," *etc.*—**He would be utterly contemned**; lit., "contemning they would contemn him." The impersonal plural expresses, as in the similar passage Prov. vi. 30, the universal sentiment not merely that of those in particular who were solicited by false love and with money. The repetition of the verb by means of the Infin. absol. expresses the very high degree of contempt, which such an one as is here spoken of would encounter.

4. SECOND SCENE.—*a.* SHULAMITH'S LITTLE SISTER, vers. 8-10. WEISSBACH is alone in attempting to point out an intimate connection between these verses and the preceding. He says: "What was uttered ver. 7 *c*, *d* as a universal proposition

Digitized by Google

(*viz.* that money and property have no value as compared with love) is now vers. 8, 9 conditionally illustrated in the sister who is still young and destitute of charms, whilst Shulamith represents herself, ver. 10, as the antithesis." As this view can only be based on a very artificial interpretation of vers. 8, 9, we shall have to abide by the looser connection maintained, *e. g.*, by DELITZSCH and HAHN. They suppose that the sense expressed by Shulamith, vers. 6, 7, of the high happiness which she possesses and enjoys in her love for the king, reminded her of her young sister who was still debarred from such loving enjoyment, and she accordingly expresses her solicitude for her future conduct and fortunes. Upon this assumption the unmistakable dramatic progress receives due acknowledgment without the sundering of all connection between the new scene which begins here and that which preceded it, as is the case, *e. g.*, in UMBREIT's view, according to which vers. 6, 7 constitute the closing sentiment of the drama (spoken by the poet himself) and vers. 8-14 a twofold supplement to it. So in the similar views of RENAN, DÖPKE, MAGNUS (comp. above No. 1) and no less so finally on the assumption of DÖDERLEIN, EWALD, HEILIGSTEDT, MEIER and ROCKE, that Shulamith narrates in vers. 8, 9 what had formerly been said by the brothers in relation to her little sister. In opposition to this latter opinion, according to which vers. 8, 9 are to be regarded as recitative, and Shulamith's own words do not begin again until ver. 10, DELITZSCH correctly urges: "It would be vain to appeal to iii. 2; v. 3 to prove the possibility of this view; in both those passages the introduction of the language of another without any formal indication of the fact, occurs in the course of a narrative, whilst viii. 8 f. is only converted into a narrative by the "*fratres aliquando dixerunt*" (HEILIGSTEDT) understood. There is nothing to justify such an insertion. The only seeming necessity for it might be found in vi. 9, according to which Shulamith herself appears to be the "little sister." It is not, however, said in vi. 9 that "Shulamith was the only daughter of her mother, but only that her mother did not possess or know her equal," (comp. *in loc.*). HITZIG, too, emphatically opposes understanding the passage as a narration, but assumes that both verses, ver. 9, as well as ver. 8, were spoken by Shulamith's brothers, which is contrary to the relation of the two verses as question and answer. Nevertheless this assumption, shared also by VAIHINGER, especially if one brother is supposed to speak in ver. 8, and the other in ver. 9, would be far more tolerable than BÖTTCHER's view, which makes Shulamith's mother put the question in ver. 8, and one of her sons answer it in ver. 9; or than the opinion of HENGSTENBERG that both vers. 8 and 9 were spoken by Solomon; or than the view of STARKE, and of many of the older interpreters, that ver. 8 belongs to Shulamith, and ver. 9 to Solomon.

Ver. 8. **We have a sister, little, and she has** (as yet) **no breasts.** On קָטָן "little" in the sense of young, belonging to the period of childhood, comp. Gen. ix. 24; xxvii. 15; 1 Kings iii. 7; and in relation to the breasts as the criterion of virgin maturity, Ezek. xvi. 7.—**What shall we do . . . . in the day that she shall be spoken for?** The day that a maiden is sued for, is when she becomes of a marriageable age. The suit was addressed in the first instance to the father of the damsel, or to her brothers, not directly to herself (Gen. xxxiv. 11, 18; xxiv. 50, *etc.*).

Ver. 9. **If she be a wall, we will build upon her a silver castle; but if she be a door, we will stop her up with a cedar board.** DELITZSCH correctly paraphrases these words: "If she opposes a firm and successful resistance to all immoral suggestions, we will build on her, as on a solid wall, a castle of silver, *i. e.*, we will bestow upon her the freedom and honor due to her virgin purity and steadfastness, so that she may shine forth in the land like a stately castle on a lofty wall which is seen far and wide. But if she is a door, *i. e.*, open and accessible to the arts of seduction, we will block her up with cedar boards, *i. e.*, watch her so that she cannot be approached by any seducer, nor any seducer approached by her."—As soon as we suppose the brothers to give this answer respecting their younger sister, it loses the strange or even offensive appearance which its figures would certainly have in the mouth of Shulamith. Then, too, we shall not be compelled to seek for a closer connection between this sentiment and the main action of the poem (as the advocates of the shepherd hypothesis do), but can abide by the simple assumption that what is here said, as in general, all from ver. 8 onward, is simply designed to form a cheerful and sportive termination of the whole matter. Least of all need we take refuge in the over-refined view of WEISSBACH that ver. 9 is a continuation of the language of Shulamith, who supposes two questions to be put to her by certain men respecting her sister when marriageable, and immediately replies to them both—so that the sentences run thus:

> . . . . What shall we do then in respect to our sister when they ask about her:
> (*a*) "Is she a wall?"
> Ans. We will build a little silver wall around her (?);
> (*b*) "Is she a door?"
> Ans. We will construct around her (?) a cedar frame (?)—.

As to the particulars observe further: The wall חוֹמָה is not designed to set forth the idea of lofty stature (קוֹמָה vii. 8), or the impossibility of being scaled, but simply that of the firm resistance which checks the further advance of foes (HITZIG correctly, vs. WEISSBACH).—The "castle of silver" טִירַת כֶּסֶף to be built on the wall is, of course, only to be conceived of as a small but strong castle, tower or bulwark (comp. טִירָה in Num. xxxi. 10; Ezek. xxv. 4, *etc.*), or if any prefer as a "pinnacle" or "battlement crowning the wall" (HITZIG, HEILIGSTEDT, MAGN., MEIER, HÖLEM.—comp. the SEPT.: ἔπαλξις),—not as a "palace" (GOLTZ) [so Eng. Ver.] or "habitation" (HENGSTENBERG), or "court-yard" (BÖTTCHER), or "low fence" (WEISSBACH). The meaning of the figure is admirably illustrated by HITZIG by a reference to our proverbial form of speech, "He (or she) deserves to be set in gold."

Digitized by Google

He also not inappropriately suggests an allusion to the way that oriental ladies to this day decorate their head-dress with strings of silver coins or with horn-like ornaments of embossed silver and the like (comp. on iv. 4 above). On the contrary the sense which VAIHINGER would attribute to the expression is undemonstrable and in bad taste: "we will seek to obtain a large dowry by her." And WEISSBACH's explanation is perfectly absurd and trifling: "we will carry up a silver wall around her, who needs no such protection."—The door presents a fitting contrast to the wall, because it is easily opened and admits everything through it; an expressive emblem of unchastity which is open to every amorous seduction. "Stopping up" or "blocking" (HITZIG: "barricading") this door with a "cedar board" naturally means a determined warding off of those seductive influences, and rendering all dissoluteness impossible by the most sedulous care. By this is not to be understood a "fore-door or vestibule door in front of the proper door" (HUG), nor a "cedar post" (WEISSB.), nor a tablet to be put on the door as an ornament (HÖLEM.), but quite certainly a plank or board to be put against the door on the inside to prevent it from turning and opening. This board was to be of cedar, because this wood is a particularly strong building material and not liable to rot.*

Ver. 10. **I was a wall and my breasts like towers.** This is evidently said by Shulamith, whose thoughts were turned back to her own maiden state by her brothers' faithful care shown for the honor and purity of her little sister. Looking back upon this time, which now lies in the past, she can joyfully affirm that all seduction recoiled from her as from a solid wall, and that no one had dared to venture an assault upon her pure and awe-inspiring charms (her breasts as inaccessible and hard to be scaled as towers upon walls, comp. vii. 9 *b*).—**Then was I in his eyes as one that finds peace,** *i. e.*, this careful preservation of my chastity, this keeping my charms pure and sacred procured me his, the king's, favor and inmost love. שָׁלוֹם "welfare, peace," is here as in אִישׁ שְׁלוֹמִי Ps. xli. 10, a synonym of חֵן "favor" or חֶסֶד "kindness" (comp. מָצָא חֵן Gen. vi. 8; xix. 19; Jer. xxxi. 2, as well as חֶסֶד וָחֵן Esth. ii. 17) and is not without a delicate allusion to the name of Solomon. There is also a certain refinement in the expression that Shulamith does not exactly say אָז מָצָאתִי בְעֵינָיו שָׁלוֹם "then I found peace in his eyes," but with a modest circumlocution: "then was I as one (כְּ as in כְּאָח viii. 1) that finds peace in his eyes," then I appeared to him worthy of his cordial affection (comp. DELITZSCH and HÖLEMANN *in loc.*). The expression contains no allusion, therefore, to the preceding comparison of herself to a wall surmounted by towers, or to a fortification. If the poet intended by אז הייתי בעיניו כמוצאת שלום to express the meaning: "then he finally left me in peace, instead of assailing me further," he did so in a most strange and unintelligible manner (vs. HITZIG), and to regard חוֹמָה "wall" as the subject of מוֹצֵאת "found" (EWALD, WEISSBACH) will not answer on account of this word being too remote; and such a form of speech as "a wall or fortress finds peace—it surrenders or it is spared," receives no confirmation from the Old Testament elsewhere, or from oriental literature generally.

5. CONTINUATION.—*b.* SHULAMITH'S INTERCESSION FOR HER BROTHERS, vers. 11, 12.—These difficult verses can only be explained in accordance with the context, and with the whole course and tenor of the piece, by assuming with DELITZSCH that the "vineyard of Solomon in Baal-hamon," mentioned in ver. 11, is simply adduced by way of example; that the speaker's "own vineyard," as in i. 6 (comp. iv. 12 ff.), is a figurative designation of herself and her charms, which she devotes to the king; and finally that the "keepers of its fruit" (ver. 12 *b*) is a designation of her brothers, the faithful and zealous guardians of her innocence; and consequently the whole must be taken to be an intercession of Shulamith on behalf of her brothers. This intercession fitly connects itself with their tender care for her little sister, just now manifested; and it likewise refers back in a suitable manner to the mention before made of her brothers, i. 6, and thus helps to bring about a termination of the whole, in which everything shall be satisfactorily adjusted and harmonized. We therefore reject the following divergent explanations of this brief section: 1) Shulamith declares that she has herself guarded her virgin innocence better than Solomon his vineyard in Baal-hamon, whose keepers had secretly retained, besides the fruit, two hundred shekels for themselves; she therefore needs no other keepers, not even the guardianship of her brothers (HERDER, UMBREIT,

* [THRUPP quotes in opposition to the view above given of this verse the language of RENAN: "This interpretation is pressed by serious difficulties. I do not insist on its vapid and feeble character. We may admit contrary to all probability, that the silver battlements of which the brothers speak might denote a sort of ornament as a recompense of the young girl's virtue, it will still remain a trait whose signification is an enigma. If the brothers wish to punish their sister in case she should commit any fault, why do they menace her with panels of cedar? It is evident that this implies an idea of riches and luxury. Battlements of silver, panels of cedar answer to one another. Neither of these alternatives includes an idea of punishment or recompense." THRUPP himself supposes it to be the language of the bridegroom, and its meaning to be: "We will build her up, and that in full glory. The walls and the doors come into view as two of the most obvious features of every edifice. As for her wall of enclosure, we will fence her around with silver; as for her doors, of cedar alone and of no inferior wood, shall they be constructed." BURROWES: "Her nature should be adorned with ornaments, giving more beauty and strength than turrets of silver, or a richly carved door of the most elegant cedar." MOODY STUART: "They liken the little sister to two of the principal parts of a building or temple—first, the wall without which there is no stability, no house; and second, the door without which there is no entrance to the house, and no use of it. The wall is the image of stability on which, with its solid strength, is to be built a silver palace for habitation and for beauty. The door is the image of accessibleness; but a door-way without the wooden frame work, requires cedar boards to distinguish it from a mere open thoroughfare." GOOD understands by the "silver turrets:" "The prominent charm of an ample dowry shall immediately be her own;" and by the "door encased in cedar:" "She shall be the graceful entrance to my favor and friendship." HARMER, who supposes the little sister to be Pharaoh's daughter espoused to Solomon, imagines that the "wall" and the door" are emblems of the political consequences of the alliance as on the one hand "a guard and defence, giving a new security to Judæa," and on the other opening "a free communication between Egypt and the Jewish country."]

Digitized by Google

DÖPKE, HITZIG, ROCKE). 2) Shulamith protests that she disdains all the wealth and the treasures of Solomon, which, like his vineyard in Baal-hamon, he is obliged to entrust to the guardianship of others; her vineyard, *i. e.*, her innocence and virtue is under her own control, and in this possession of hers she has enough (DATHE, ROSENMUELLER, EWALD, HEILIGSTEDT, *etc.*). 3) Shulamith triumphantly relates that Solomon offered her the rich vineyard at Baal-hamon, whither she had been carried to his pleasure-palace, with all its produce, and the entire park as her own property, if she would be his; he was even willing to release her from the payment of the two hundred shekels due to each of its keepers; but she had renounced the whole for the sake of her lover, who now, as her own chosen vineyard(!) stood before her (VAIHINGER). 4) Shulamith means to say, Solomon must have his distant vineyard in Baal-hamon kept for him, and must therefore pay away considerable of its proceeds; but she, on the contrary, kept her own vineyard, that is to say Solomon (!), herself, and hence possessed his love alone without being obliged to share it with others (HÖLEMANN). 5) Shulamith intends by Solomon's vineyard in Baal-hamon herself, and by her own vineyard the shepherd, her lover; she means to say, Solomon did indeed get Shulamith into his power at Shulem (=Baal-hamon), and offered her one thousand shekels by each of the ladies of the court as her keepers; but he may keep this money, for her proper keeper, the shepherd, now stands before her again (MEIER). 6) Shulamith means to say that Solomon, who has let out his vineyard to keepers, receives as the owner one thousand silverlings in cash from each keeper, whilst the keepers retain for their pay five times as much in fruit = five thousand shekels. But Shulamith, who keeps her own vineyard, *i. e.*, herself with all her personal charms, and consequently might, as both owner and keeper, retain the entire produce for herself, gives the use of the fruit, consequently the five parts, in this case = 1000 (!) to Solomon, and only retains for herself as keeper the 200, *i. e.*, the possession; the usufruct shall be his, she will only be the keeper of her vineyard (WEISSBACH). 7) Solomon's vineyard in Baal-hamon denotes the kingdom of God founded in the midst of the world, in the midst of the savage masses of heathen population. The keepers of this vineyard are the several Christian nations, each of which has to pay one thousand shekels to the heavenly Solomon as the product of his labor. Each must therefore produce as much fruit as the people of Israel, the tenants of the vineyard mentioned, ver. 12, which forms one part of the great vineyard of the Church. Each people then receives in return a reward of grace of two hundred shekels, that is to say, a fifth part of the produce of his portion; and the people of Israel receives no more, comp. Matt. xx. 1–16 (HENGSTENBERG). 8) Solomon's vineyard at Baal-hamon denotes the Church of the Lord in the midst of the world. Its keepers are the prophets, apostles, pastors and teachers of Christendom, to whom two-tenths (twice as much, therefore, as under the Old Testament) shall be given as a reward of grace for their faithful raising of fruit, or for their leading many thousand souls to the heavenly Solomon (CALOV, MICHAEL., MARCK., BERLEB. BIB., and in general most of the old allegorists). 9) The vineyard at Baal-hamon denotes the Gentile world generally, Shulamith's vineyard, ver. 12, Japhetic gentilism as one half of this Gentile world, the two hundred silverlings the spiritual peace granted by the king to Japhetic humanity in regard for their loving submission to him, *etc.** (HAHN).

Ver. 11. **Solomon has a vineyard in Baal-hamon.** Baal-hamon is, without doubt, the place not far from Dothaim in the south of the tribe of Issachar, which is called *Βελαμὼν* or *Βαλαμὼν*, Judith viii. 3, a locality therefore not very remote from Shunem. It derived its name from the Syro-Egyptian god, Ammon הָמוֹן (=אָמוֹן Jer. xlvi. 25), which may have been worshipped there, just as Baal-gad (Josh. xi. 17; xii. 7, *etc.*) was named from Gad, the well-known Babylonish god of fortune. Baal-hamon scarcely signifies "the populous" (VULG., WEISSB., *etc.*), and it is still more improbable that it is to be identified, as many of the older writers assumed, with Baalbec in Cœle-Syria (where vineyards could hardly ever have flourished), or with Hammon, חַמּוֹן, Josh. xix. 28, or with Baalgad, Josh. xi. 17, *etc.* But if that locality near Shunem is intended, it by no means follows that Shulamith had been carried off to just that spot by Solomon, and detained there for some time as a prisoner in a pleasure-palace of the king, as VAIH. strangely supposes. But Shulamith only names this vineyard as an instance very near her home of a royal property let out on high rent, in order afterwards to illustrate by it her relation to the king as well as to her brothers.—**He committed the vineyard to the keepers**—*i. e.*, to several at once, amongst whom the piece of ground was parcelled out in greater or smaller portions. That these

* [GOOD finds in these verses a request made of Solomon by his royal bride that he would "consign the estate which, prior to her marriage, she had possessed in Baal-hamon, and which now appertained to himself as a part of the dowry she had brought him, to her younger and unendowed sister." BURROWES: "While Solomon's tenants were obliged to pay the stipulated rent, the spouse speaks of a vineyard which was her own, but which she would nevertheless so keep under her own control and management, as to be able while paying the keepers equitable wages, to offer yearly to the king a thousand pieces of silver as a testimonial of her love." MOODY STUART: "Solomon is the Messiah, and Baal-hamon is no doubt either Jerusalem or the land of Israel. The vineyard was let to keepers, who were to render its fruits to the king—they were to render them, but the silence as to the fulfilment implies that the covenant was not kept. The New Testament church now declares, that by the Lord's grant the vineyard is hers, and undertakes, through grace, that she will never lose sight of it. She further engages to assign to those who labor in it a suitable and moderate maintenance, and allots 'two hundred pieces of silver to those that keep the fruit of it.' At the same time she promises that the full revenue shall only be the Lord's, and that she will never attempt, like her predecessor, to claim the vineyard as her own." The same author also calls attention to the "remarkable agreement between this passage and the reference to the Lord's vineyard, in the fifth chapter of Isaiah," and adds: "The Song of Solomon was evidently much in the mind of Isaiah, and he refers to it more or less directly in every page of his prophecies." This last statement is verified through several pages filled with passages from Isaiah, which bear more or less affinity in language or ideas to expressions in the Song of Solomon. The interesting relation thus suggested as existing between these two books, has its importance in determining the estimate put upon the Song of Solomon, and the interpretation given to it in Old Testament times and by inspired men.—TR.]

Digitized by Google

keepers rented the property is shown by what follows.—**Each was to bring for its fruit a thousand of silver**—*i. e.*, a thousand shekels of silver. From the high rent may be inferred the productiveness of the property; for that its annual yield corresponded to the agreement is certainly presupposed, as well as that a part of the produce of his piece annually remained for each tenant—that is, on an average, about two hundred shekels (see ver. 12).

Ver. 12. **My vineyard, my own, is before me**—*i. e.*, I take charge myself of my own vineyard, *viz.*, of myself and my womanly charms, of myself as an object of men's admiration and courtship. Since I came to maturity, I have been my own keeper, and have with entire freedom transferred to my royal husband this right of mine to dispose of myself. I have no longer any other keepers but him, who is one with me (comp. on i. 6, p. 56).—**The thousand is thine, O Solomon, and two hundred for the keepers of its fruit**—*i. e.*, the entire proceeds are due to thee; I remain wholly thine own with all that I am and have. But they who kept my fruit, *i. e.*, my innocence and virtue, before I was thine, should not go empty away. These trusty brotherly guardians of my maidenhood, who once watched over me as they now faithfully and sedulously watch over our little sister (ver. 9), must be commended to thy love and favor, as in my heart they hold the next place after thee. —This explanation, it is true, does not completely remove all difficulties; but it involves fewer doubtful and forced assumptions than the other attempted explanations adduced above.

6. Conclusion.—*c.* The cheerful pleasantry and singing of the royal couple, vers. 13, 14 — These two concluding verses contain, according to Herder, the fragment of a conversation; according to Umbreit the serenade of a young man from the city with the answer of his lady-love in the country; according to Döpke a "small duet" belonging to the initial period of Shulamith's love, and here appended by the poet; according to Magnus, a glossed and mutilated fragment of a love-song; while most of the advocates of the shepherd hypothesis see in it a colloquy between the lover and Shulamith, consisting of an invitation to sing on the part of the former, and a song of a roguish and playful character, which Shulamith thereupon sings (Ewald, Hitzig, Vaihinger, *etc.*). This last view evidently has the most in its favor on account of the recurrence of הַשְׁמִיעִנִי "let me hear," from ii. 14, and the unmistakable resemblance of the song in ver. 14 to ii. 17 (and partly also to ii. 15). Only there is no reason to suppose the person, who invites her to sing and whom Shulamith addresses in her song as דּוֹדִי "my beloved," to be a young shepherd. The epithet which he bestows upon her, "thou that dwellest in the gardens," makes it seem far more likely that he was a citizen of rank, and even resident in a palace, a man of royal race exalted greatly above her station in life. But little reason as there is to regard another than Solomon as the "beloved" who speaks in ver. 13 and is then addressed in the sprightly little song, there is quite as little for assigning this occurrence with Hitzig to a period considerably later than the one recorded just before, or for assuming with Böttcher that the bridegroom, in quitting the merry engagement feast in the house of Shulamith's mother, wanted to hear one more song from his bride before he left her for the last brief interval prior to the celebration of their marriage. Delitzsch and Weissbach understand the passage correctly, only the latter preposterously imagines the locality of the action here as in the final section generally to be the royal palace in Jerusalem (comp. p. 127).—**Thou that dwellest in the gardens.**—Literally, "thou sitting in the gardens," *i. e.*, thou resident in gardens, who art opposed to living in populous cities and splendid palaces (comp. i. 16 f.; iv. 6; v. 7; vii. 12 ff.). Solomon here evidently means to allude with pleasant raillery to the fact that his beloved, who had so often before exhibited her longing for the gardens and meadows of her home, was now exactly in her element, and ought therefore to be in the best of moods.—**Companions are listening for thy voice; let me hear it.**—The חֲבֵרִים "companions" are, according to Magnus, "neighbors," or "the family;" according to Hufnagel, "female friends;" according to Moldenh., Ewald, Ren., *etc.*, "bridemen" (*des paranymphes*, Renan); according to Vaihinger, "shepherds, fellow-pasturers;" according to Weissbach, Solomon himself, who here jestingly represents himself as a shepherd, or rather in the plural as "shepherds!" and finally, according to Herder, Hug, Delitzsch, "playmates" or "youthful associates" of Shulamith. This last view has most in its favor; only it is a matter of course that the companions of Shulamith's youth were likewise those of her brothers; they are consequently in all likelihood shepherds and country people from Shunem and its vicinity. They were probably, therefore, the same as the speakers in ver. 5 *a* of this chapter; on the contrary they are not the companions of Solomon (comp. v. 1), of whom Shulamith spoke i. 7 (vs. Ewald).

Ver. 14. **Flee, my beloved.** The words sound like sending off, or if any prefer "scaring away" or at least "urging out into the open ground" (Delitzsch). They do not, however, by any means express seriously intended coyness, as is shown by the very form of the address דּוֹדִי "my beloved." They rather invite to hasten and range with the singer over the mountains and plains as is shown by what follows. ברח is not, however, exactly equivalent to "hasten, up!" as is maintained by Vaihinger and Weissbach, who refer to Num. xxiv. 11, Isa. xxx. 16, *etc.* For even in these passages, as well as in Gen. xxvii. 43; Am. vii. 12, the primary signification of this verb "to flee" is clearly apparent. Ewald arbitrarily: the meaning is that "he should *cut across*, leave his companions and not stay opposite to her but hasten to her side," *etc.*—**And be like a gazelle,** *etc.* comp. on ii. 17. In place of the "mountains of separation" or "cleft mountains" there mentioned we here have balsam mountains or "heights of scented herbs" (Weissbach), which to be sure are meant in a different sense from iv. 6. Shulamith here calls by this name the mountains and hills of her home (comp. ii. 8) because they were

Digitized by Google

just then in the season of spring or early summer covered with fragrant flowers of all sorts and accordingly filled with balmy odors (comp. ii. 12 f., vi. 11).—On the import of this verse as the conclusion of the entire poem, comp. DELITZSCH, p. 153: "Amid the cheerful notes of this song we lose sight of the pair rambling over the flowery heights, and the graceful spell of the Song of Songs, which bounds gazelle-like from one scene of beauty to another, vanishes with them."

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The allegorical exegesis is in this section less able than ever to bring all into a form possessing unity and regular structure, and to reach really certain results, as the attempts above exhibited (p. 182) to give an allegorical explanation of vers. 11, 12 have evinced. Not only in this passage but in other parts of this section this mode of interpretation shows a very great multiplicity and divergence of opinions among its various advocates. The "little sister," ver. 8 f. is by some made to denote the first-fruits of Jews and Gentiles received into the church immediately after the ascension of Christ (CASSIODORUS, BEZA, GREGORY, RUPERT v. DEUTZ, *etc.*); by others the entire body of the Jews and Gentiles yet to be converted (HEUNISCH, REINHARD, RAMBACH, likewise HAHN, who refers it particularly to "Hamitic Gentilism"); by others the weak in faith and young beginners in Christianity belonging to every period of the church in their totality (MARCK., BERLEB. BIB., STARKE); and finally by others the daughter of Zion at the time of the first beginnings of her conversion to the heavenly Solomon (HENGST. and others). "The wall and the door," ver. 9, are indeed mostly understood of the steadfast and faithful keeping of the word of God and of its zealous proclamation to the Gentiles (according to 1 Cor. xvi. 9, *etc.*); but some also explain them of the valiant in faith and the weak in faith, or of the learned and simple, or of faithful Christians and such as are recreant and easily accessible to the arts of seduction. And then according to these various interpretations the "silver bulwarks" are now the miracles of the first witnesses of Jesus, now the distinguished teachers of the church, now pious Christian rulers, now the testimonies of Holy Scripture by which faith is strengthened, *etc.* And again by the "cedar board" are sometimes understood the ten commandments or the law, sometimes Christian teachers, sometimes the examples of the saints, sometimes the salutary discipline of the cross and sufferings for Christ's sake, *etc.* (comp. STARKE *in loc.*). By the "companions" or "associates" who listen for the voice of the bride, ver. 13, PISCATOR in all seriousness understands God the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost; whilst the followers of COCCEIUS for the most part referred it to the angels; some of them, however, to true Christians; and the two most recent interpreters of this class suppose that the Gentile world before the time of Christ is intended by the expression, but with this difference that one (HAHN) has in mind chiefly the Gentiles as hostile to revelation, the other (HENGSTENBERG) as kindly disposed to the people of God and His revelation.

2. It is apparent from the exegetical explanations given above, that this divergence in the allegorical exegesis is matched by an equal variety of opinions and uncertain guess-work on the part of the merely historical interpreters of this chapter; and in fact it is scarcely possible by even the most cautious procedure to arrive at perfectly certain results in respect to the meaning and the connection of the sentences of this section with their fragment-like brevity and obscurity. This, however, only makes it the more necessary with a view to its practical application to adhere to its leading and most perspicuous passage which formulates the fundamental thought not only of the closing act, but of the entire poem with solemn emphasis and with an elevation and pathos of language purposely rising to a climax. We mean the spirited encomium contained in vers. 6 and 7 of love between man and woman as a mysterious divine creation, and a power superior to death, Shulamith's exalted panegyric of conjugal and wedded love, the culminating point of the entire poem, and the only true key to its meaning according to the unanimous assumptions of interpreters of all schools. DELITZSCH (p. 182 f.) has given the best exposition of the thought contained in this leading passage, which has in it the gist of the whole matter: "Shulamith herself here declares how she loves Solomon and how she wishes to be loved by him. This spontaneous testimony discloses to us the intermingling of human freedom and of divine necessity in true love between man and woman. Love is a שַׁלְהֶבֶת יָהּ, a flame kindled by God Himself. Man cannot produce it in himself, and though he employ all his wealth for the purpose, he cannot kindle it in others. She is speaking, of course, of true love, which is directed to the person and not to any mere things. Man cannot create this love by his own agency. It is an operation of God—a divine flame, which seizes upon a man like death with irresistible power, and can neither be quenched nor extinguished by any calamity or by any hostile force. There is thus evinced in true love an inevitable and invincible power of divine necessity. But this divine necessity has for its other side human freedom. It is the inmost and truest ego of a man, from which this divine flame of love blazes forth. Whilst a man becomes a lover by a resistless divine energy, the lover's passionate desire for the possession of the beloved object is as vehement and inflexible as the resistless and all-devouring grave. The lover loves because he must, but love is at the same time his most pleasurable volition, a return of love his most ardent desire. Smitten with love to Shulamith Solomon exclaims: How beautiful and how comely art thou, O love, among delights (vii. 7); and smitten with love to Solomon Shulamith prays: Place me as a signet upon thy heart, as a signet ring upon thine arm (viii. 6)." In this declaration of Shulamith, which gathers up all the main elements in the idea of wedded love and experience, and accordingly formulates the fundamental thought of the entire poem there is no allusion indeed to the blessing of children as the resplendent consummation of the wedded communion of man and wife, as also no express mention is made of

Digitized by Google

this matter elsewhere throughout the piece. For to see an allusion to it in what Shulamith says, viii. 12, of the "thousand" due to her husband from the produce of his vineyard, would evidently be forced and arbitrary. But DELITZSCH properly remarks in relation to this omission of an apparently essential particular: "The author of Canticles has avoided everything, which would look to an externalizing of the relation, which he describes. He makes no mention of children; for a marriage in which the parties who conclude it are not an end to each other, but merely a means for obtaining posterity, does not correspond to its idea. Children are by divine blessing the sparks which result, when the flames of two souls flash into one. The latter is the main thing in marriage." It is also a delicate feature of great psychological as well as æsthetic value, that Shulamith, the chaste and pure-minded maiden, though silent respecting the blessing of children, mentions instead with tender love and solicitude her little sister and her brothers, the same who had previously been angry with her and treated her harshly (i. 6), and consults with her brothers respecting the future of the former and in her intercession with her royal husband lays to heart the future of her brothers. This overplus of love, which with all the ardent fervor of her devotion to her husband, she still preserves for her own family (see viii. 12); this touching sisterly love, which is essentially identical with her faithful and pious filial devotion to her mother repeatedly shown in the previous portion of the Song; this combined with her gladsome, cheery, playful disposition, which expresses itself in her concluding words, adds the finishing touch, sweetly transfiguring this noble picture which the poet would sketch of her character as the ideal of a bride and of a young wife, and by which—an unconscious organ of the Holy Spirit—he has set forth the idea and mystery of marriage itself as a sacred and divine institution.

3. From this luminous and revered female figure there proceeds a transfiguring radiance, in which the form of her royal husband, the enthusiastic admirer and spirited singer of her love and her loveliness also shines with a clear and pleasing light. But yet for the sake of a complete and thoroughly correct typical estimate of the transaction, the sad truth must not be left out of the account, that the bond of love so purely and holily regarded by her was nevertheless at last desecrated and broken by him. For that this was the case, can scarcely be doubted from the manner in which both the historians of the Old Testament record the final fortunes of Solomon and the end of his life (1 Kin. xi. 1-43, 2 Chron. ix. 22-31). Of a sincere and permanent conversion of this monarch to a God-fearing and virtuous walk in the evening of his days neither the book of Kings nor Chronicles has anything to relate, the latter of which would scarcely have omitted to note a similarity in the life of Solomon to that of Manasseh in this respect. That no proof can be drawn from the book of Ecclesiastes for this view, a favorite one with many of the older theologians, the introduction to this book may teach us (§ 4). We must stand by the assumption confirmed by 1 Kin. xi. and contradicted by no other testimony, that the unhappy king afterwards proceeded from that stage of polygamous degeneracy indicated in this Song, especially in vi. 8, to still grosser extravagances in this direction, and thus at last filled up the measure of his sins, and brought upon himself and upon his house the corresponding judgment beginning with the revolt of Jeroboam. He must accordingly have deeply wounded Shulamith's heart by a speedy return to the criminally voluptuous and idolatrous manners of his court and have repaid her love so pure and ardent with base infidelity. This deplorable condition of things casts a light not very creditable to him upon his relation to his antitype in the history of redemption, the Messiah. Love for the purest and best of the daughters of his people, whom he adorned with the crown royal and raised from an humble station to the throne of David, could not permanently purify and hallow the earthly Solomon and rescue him from the abyss of crime into which he was in danger of sinking. The heavenly Solomon, on the contrary, must laboriously lift the Church, which He is gathering to Himself from amongst mankind, step by step to the luminous elevation of His own holiness and truth; He must have great indulgence for her weakness, must pardon her many relapses into her old walk of sin, must absolutely despair of presenting His bride perfectly pure, without spot or wrinkle, so long as she remains in this present world. In the Old Testament type, therefore, we find a sad contrast between the fidelity of the wife and the unfaithfulness of her husband. Of the Messianic archetype, on the other hand, it is written with perfect truth: "Though we be unfaithful, yet He abideth faithful; He cannot deny Himself" (2 Tim. ii. 13). In the type no really pure, complete and durable realization of the idea of marriage is reached, but the natural relation existing for a time is only too speedily perverted to its opposite by the fault of the husband. In the fulfilment of the type it is the husband, the new Adam, the Son of Man who came down from heaven and yet is essentially in heaven (John iii. 13), who not merely concludes the marriage covenant with mankind, but likewise preserves, confirms, refines and conducts it step by step to its ideal consummation, which is at the same time the palingenesia and perfection of humanity. To our human consciousness this parallel, which strictly carried out leaves scarcely more than a faint glimmer of resemblance between the type and the archetype, has in it something deeply humiliating. But it may nevertheless operate to the strengthening of faith in our heart, for it points us to the one divine helper and physician, who heals all our diseases; it drives us into the arms of the one mediator and comforter, who is rich in mercy unto all them that call upon Him; it encourages us to childlike confidence in the heavenly author and finisher of our faith, whose grace worketh all in all according to His word of promise (John v. 15; Phil. i. 6; ii. 12, *etc.*).

His love no end nor measure knows,
No change can turn its course,
Immutably the same it flows,
From one eternal source.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Princeton University Library
32101 063611501

Digitized by Google